

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2151

not tend to bear out the President's statement that he is proposing in his budget "only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."

Since some of our colleagues may not have seen the editorial in the Washington Daily News, I would like to take this opportunity to call it to their particular attention. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include this editorial as part of my remarks:

THE SELF-PERPETUATORS

Recently we were looking at the Rural Electrification Administration. What strikes us most about REA is that it lends huge sums of money to electric and phone co-operatives for 2 percent a year. It gets this money from the U.S. Treasury—which pays upward of 3 to 4 percent for the same money.

REA is a losing proposition—to the taxpayers.

Now we hear from Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL, who represents an agricultural district in Illinois.

He says one trouble is that REA has gone far out from its original purpose. It started out merely to help farmers get electric power. Now it has become a power agency, with firm control over the associations in its debt, and it is financing industrial machinery, "not to help the farmer but merely to expand its own bureaucratic activities."

Although 98 percent of U.S. farms now are electrified, REA still is lending money as fast as ever—its budgeted program for next year is \$81 million over this year. Mr. MICHEL has the explanation:

"The major share of REA's money is now being loaned to put REA permanently and completely in the power business—by constructing generating plants and transmission systems to serve customers and areas that are already receiving central-station electric service in adequate amounts at reasonable prices."

This is the story of nearly all Government agencies. The longer they last, the bigger they get; and the bigger they get, the longer they last.

This, of course, is one item in what President Kennedy calls his minimum necessary budget. It hardly tends to bear out his statement that he is proposing only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs.

(Mr. MURPHY of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record at this point and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MURPHY of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. FARBSTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. FARBSTAIN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS AND AGRICULTURAL AID FOR CUBA

(Mr. MONAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations decision to go forward with the agricultural aid project for Cuba is a very unfortunate one. It comes at a time when the U.N. is under increasing attack in the United States and it will undoubtedly increase the strength of this attack and make support much more difficult.

On June 1, 1961, and again in January of this year, I called this matter to the attention of the Congress and also communicated my objections to U.N. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. Only last week I made known to the House the contents of a letter I received from Ambassador Stevenson in which he asserted his opposition to the project and thanked me for my efforts in this connection.

Naturally, one must expect some give and take in any organization which purports to represent conflicting interests of nations throughout the world, but to compel the United States and other friendly nations to contribute to the strength of a regime which plans to export Communist imperialism to Latin America just does not make sense.

The statement of Paul G. Hoffman, American Managing Director for the U.N. Special Fund, that not one single American dollar will be used in this project is not wholly candid. So long as the United States is paying the major portion of the support of the United Nations, this country will be making an indirect contribution to this project.

I have supported the United Nations in the past and I voted to authorize the purchase of U.N. bonds in the last session of Congress, but I must admit that this recent action does not strengthen my support of the organization.

GENERAL KOSCIUSZKO'S BIRTHDAY OBSERVED BY POLISH ORGANIZATIONS AT WREATH LAYING CEREMONY BEFORE POLISH-AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY HERO'S STATUE IN LAFAYETTE SQUARE

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 12, we observed not only the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, but also the birthday of the great Polish patriot and Revolutionary War hero, Gen. Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

I had the distinguished pleasure, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, Congressman JOHN BRADENAS, of speaking at the wreath laying ceremony at the Kosciuszko statue in Lafayette Square, near the White House. This fitting tribute on the 217th anniversary of General Kosciuszko's birth was sponsored by the Polish-American Congress, the Polish Falcons of America and the Polish Combatants Association. Participating with Congressman Brademas and myself were Casimir Baginski, a leader of the Polish underground movement inside Poland during World

War II, Stanley Mikolajczyk, Joseph Chmielewski, and Eugene Danielewicz of the Polish-American Congress; and Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish-American Congress, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, Tadeusz Kosciuszko was a leader of Poland's fight for freedom and liberty and served as a brigadier general in the American Revolution. Most of us remember Kosciuszko as General Washington's adjutant and as a gallant soldier in the battles at New York, Yorktown, and elsewhere.

This great son of Poland was marked for a military career early in life. Born into an impoverished family, Kosciuszko attended the Royal School of Warsaw, graduating with the rank of captain. He received a state scholarship to study engineering and artillery in France. After completing his studies abroad, Kosciuszko returned to Poland in 1774 with the rank of captain of artillery.

In Poland there were few opportunities for the military talents of young Kosciuszko. He went to Paris, and there he learned of the American Revolution in 1776. That historic event on this side of the Atlantic stirred his imagination and restless spirit. He saw an opportunity to fight for a good cause. Kosciuszko's sympathy with the American Revolution was strengthened by his democratic political views in the Jeffersonian tradition.

With borrowed money, he sailed for America and arrived in Philadelphia in August. He applied at once for military service and was admitted. His first task was to draw up plans for fortifying the Delaware River, and his successful completion of this assignment earned him a commission as a colonel of engineers in the Continental Army. It was from his fortifications that Washington crossed the Delaware that Christmas night in 1776.

In the spring of the following year he joined the Northern Army at Ticonderoga. It was at Saratoga later that he made one of his most important contributions to the revolutionary cause. His choice of battlefields and the fortifications constructed under his direction enabled the American forces to win the victory which has since been termed the decisive battle of the Revolutionary War.

Shortly after the battle of Saratoga, Washington told the Congress:

I would take the liberty to mention that I have been well informed that the engineer in the Northern Army, Kosciuszko I think his name is, is a gentleman of science and merit.

From 1778 to 1780 Kosciuszko was placed in charge of erecting fortifications at West Point. In the southern campaign that brought about the defeat of Cornwallis at Yorktown, he participated actively as an engineer and cavalry officer. In 1783 Kosciuszko was rewarded for his service and devotion to the cause of American independence; he was awarded the privilege of American citizenship, a large annual pension with landed estates, and the rank of brigadier general.

The next year he returned to his native land, hoping to fight for the freedom of

his countrymen. For 20 years he continued his brave but vain efforts to free Poland from Russian domination. He died in exile in Switzerland in 1817.

His life exemplified his belief in "the incontestable right of defending ourselves against tyranny and oppression." Today on the 217th anniversary of his birth we honor the memory of this noble son of Poland who fought for freedom on two continents with bravery and distinction.

AIR POLLUTION

(Mr. BURKHALTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, air pollution and its effects on our Nation are so great that the Federal, State, and local governments, along with private industry have spent many years and thousands of dollars researching and investigating the causes of this problem.

With our fast growing population, ever increasing growth in big cities, and our country becoming more urbanized, the automobile has become one leading factor in air pollution.

The number of road vehicles, the miles traveled per vehicle, the number of automobiles per family, and the use of motor vehicle fuel have all increased enormously in the last three decades. There were 32.4 million road vehicles in 1940, 75 million in 1960, and 120 million are expected in 1980. Vehicle miles traveled—728 billion per year in 1960—is expected to soar to 1,277 billion in 1980. In 1936 almost 20 billion gallons of fuel were consumed each year; today approximately 60 billion gallons are burned annually by our automobiles, trucks, and buses. Much of the motor vehicle use occurs in urban area—47.6 percent in 1960—and such use is expected to reach nearly 61 percent in 1980. The combustion products of motor vehicle fuels and the vapors that escape in the handling of these fuels are significant factors in many community air pollution problems.

Many of the distinctive aspects of the motor vehicle pollution problem are immediately apparent. Vehicles are present in very large numbers, they are widely distributed, they are mobile, and they freely cross political boundaries. They are not subject to continuous or frequent inspection as is the case for smoke from a stack. It is worth noting that motor vehicle emissions are highly variable. Also, pollutants are discharged from more than one point in each vehicle and different methods of control may be needed for each point. It therefore follows that the control of pollution from motor vehicles requires the development of new methods, legislation, and emission standards.

As a matter of fact, I have seen a smog-suppressing device demonstrated success-

fully, one that could be put on a car at the factory and the cost would be in the neighborhood of \$7. Another feature of this device is that after approximately 12,000 miles a removable core can be replaced similar to an oil filter at about half the price of the original installation. These devices have been tested and proven in laboratory tests and are available today; so why must we keep postponing and postponing action on this 20th century monster. Our fast space and jet age is a product of our time—so also in our time should we be able to make advancements toward the eradication of smog. We must now emerge from the experimental lab and start controlling smog at one of its main sources, the exhaust from the internal combustion engines.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the bill I have introduced today to prohibit the manufacture, sale or use in commerce of any motor vehicle which discharges substances into the air in amounts found by the Surgeon General to be dangerous to public health will help to effectively control this problem of air pollution which is a national problem, and a national responsibility.

(Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, at 11 o'clock this morning the Tariff Commission made public its report to the President concerning an investigation of the softwood lumber industry. Manufacturers of softwood products had petitioned for relief under the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and for a determination that trade concessions given to Canada have caused serious injury to the domestic lumber industry. The conclusion of the Commission was that trade concessions granted to Canada, which amount in some cases to nearly 5 percent of the finished product's value, are not a major factor in causing the increased imports of softwoods from Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to criticize the conclusion of the Tariff Commission, but on behalf of the many lumber producers in my congressional district who are suffering very adverse business conditions because of the import problem, I must dissent to some of the reasons given by the Commission. Although tariff concessions may not be the major factor causing the increasing imports and the critical condition of this traditionally prosperous and essential industry, they certainly contribute to the problem. The list of major causes cited by the Commission are not entirely accurate. I know full well that the Canadian dollar devaluation, the freight-rate differentials, and the difference in governmental attitudes all contribute to the disastrous trend of the logging and lumber industry. However, I cannot accept the state-

ment of the Commission that underlying the most important cause of the cost-price squeeze is the limited availability of softwood timber in the United States. More serious error is found in the Commission's implication that the timber produced in Canada is of better quality than that produced by our domestic mills. I simply note these mistakes without comment, for their error is patent.

What can be done to soften the impact of this adverse decision? It is clear that the Congress must give more than passing consideration to the various proposed legislative solutions. A more sympathetic attitude must be adopted by the administration. We must have the cooperation of the concerned Government and industry officials. Extremely complex problems are involved, but in order to revitalize this industry, which is one of the few remaining unsubsidized producers of raw materials in the United States, we must act wisely and soon. I am grateful to the Tariff Commission for acknowledging the enormity of this problem and for indicating the necessity for governmental solution.

UNITED NATIONS AND FARM AID TO CUBA

(Mr. MORRIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the United Nations decided to go ahead and grant agricultural aid to Cuba. We learn that the 18-nation United Nations Special Fund will contribute some \$100,000 to a Cuban crop diversification test program. This is a fund the United States has supported and participated in since its inception. During 1963, we will contribute some \$28 million to the Fund or nearly 45 percent of the total budget they operate under.

When this project was originally considered by the Fund in May of 1961, preliminary approval was given for a \$3,035,600 agricultural research project, with the Fund furnishing over \$1,157,000 on a matching basis. At that time the U.S. representative in the governing Council, objected on practical economic, technical and administrative grounds. He pointed out that the Castro government had harassed and evicted a technical mission from the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences; that some 700 Cuban agronomists had been displaced by the Castro regime; that the number of Cuban cattle had dropped from nearly 6 million to less than 3½ million head; that equipment had been misused and ruined; and that Cuba had brought in agricultural technicians from the Soviet Union. These were sound technical objections, and now we find that the Fund, under the direction of its American managing di-

YOUNG REPUBLICAN MOVE FAILS

Young Republicans in the House, who 2 weeks ago engineered the surprising replacement of Representative HOEVEN, of Iowa, by Representative FORD, of Michigan, as chairman of the Republican conference, had hoped to exert their influence on the committee assignments. However, none of the young Members is on the committee on committees and their efforts had little success. Vacancies on the Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees also went to conservatives.

All the committee vacancies were the result of either retirements or November election defeats. Democrats generally expressed surprise and dismay at the Republican choices.

The five conservatives elected to the Foreign Affairs Committee are Representatives GROSS of Iowa, BERRY of South Dakota, DERWINSKI of Illinois, BATTIN of Montana, and THOMSON of Wisconsin. Last year, all five voted against the foreign aid authorization and appropriations bills and the United Nations bond bill. The other new committee member, Representative MORSE, supported these measures. Of the six Republicans who formerly held these committee spots, only one, Representative Church of Illinois, opposed the foreign aid bills last year.

HALLECK'S VIEWS REFLECTED

The new committee assignments reflect Republican leader HALLECK's general unfriendliness toward foreign aid.

The five conservatives also are expected to oppose aid for Communist nations. Mr. DERWINSKI last year led the fight to cut off foreign aid to Yugoslavia and Poland. The administration's dealings with the Republican committee members may be especially difficult this year because of the November defeat of Representative Judd of Minnesota, the leading House Republican spokesman on foreign affairs and a moderate who often sided with the administration.

The three Republican conservatives named to fill vacancies on the Appropriations Committee are Representatives HARRISON of Wyoming, REIFEL of South Dakota and WYMAN of New Hampshire. However, their election does not significantly affect the complexion of the committee because they replace three other conservative Republicans. Similarly, the election of Representative COLLIER of Illinois to replace Representative Mason of Illinois on the Ways and Means Committee represents the substitution of one conservative for another.

RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

A Democrat from the 25th District—eastern Los Angeles—of California, a certified public accountant by profession. He defeated freshman Representative John Rousselot, one of the two avowed members of the John Birch Society in the Congress. Representative CAMERON ran as an outspoken supporter of the Kennedy administration. "Mine is strictly a New Frontier effort," he said. He favored medical care for the aged under social security, Federal aid to education, liberalized foreign trade, and the Alliance for Progress.

DONALD M. FRASER

The other new Democrat on the committee. He represents the Fifth District—Minneapolis—of Minnesota. He received his LL.B. from the University of Minnesota and is a lawyer by profession. He defeated nine-term Representative Walter H. Judd, the strongest advocate of foreign aid on the Republican side of the committee. Speaking during the campaign, FRASER said the foreign aid cut adopted by the House in 1962 demonstrates impatience on the part of many Americans; an impatience which may prove costly to American security. On foreign policy in general, he said:

We should move in several ways in a peace offensive. We should explore with renewed vigor the possibility of nuclear test bans, and possible limited disarmament proposals. We should act to give the United Nations new strength through better financing and a permanent Military Establishment. We should seek a Berlin solution which will move the Iron Curtain away—instead of toward—the West.

H. R. GROSS

A Republican who has represented the Third District of Iowa (western half) since 1949. He called for a "thorough shake-up of the State Department," because "not only has the State Department failed time after time to properly assess foreign developments and thereby failed to make immediate and proper decisions, but it has repeatedly dictated to all other departments and agencies of the Government."

During the United Nations loan debate in 1962, he asked, "Why should the taxpayers be required to pay for the derelictions of the Soviet bloc and certain other nations?" On the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, he wondered if the President was talking about the fundamental American economics studied by every schoolboy when the President requested broad powers to lower tariffs.

E. Y. BERRY

A Republican who has represented the Second District of South Dakota (western half) since 1950. He is a lawyer and has been a newspaper editor and publisher. On foreign aid in 1961 he said, "The program to date has not been a success. No one denies the wanton waste, mismanagement, and failures occasioned by bureaucrats who many times are more interested in making a record than in making a friend."

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

A Republican from Chicago, representing the Fourth District since 1959. He is a businessman, past president of the West Pullman Savings and Loan Association, and was selected by the Chicago Junior Association of Commerce and Industry as one of Chicago's Ten Outstanding Young Men for 1959 and 1961. He is one of the sponsors of a Special Committee on Captive Nations and has taken the Department to task on its adverse position. Speaking about the United Nations loan last year he said, "It would be only another tragic chapter in the vacillating, fumbling, confused, and misdirected foreign policy which the Kennedy administration seems so intent on practicing."

VERNON W. THOMSON

A Republican of Richland Center, Wis., representing the Third District since 1961. He is a former Governor (1957-59), defeated by Gaylord Nelson (now Senator) in 1958. He has served in various elected public offices since 1933, having been an assistant district attorney, mayor of Richland Center, and speaker of the State assembly. He is domestically oriented in particular to the needs

of the farmers in his district, as illustrated by his opposition to the lowering of tariffs in 1962. "My district is made up of small communities and farms. The loss of even a few jobs would be a tragedy. The United States is not a high tariff Nation even now. The tariffs in the last 20 years have been slashed unmercifully."

JAMES F. BATTIN

A Republican from Billings, Mont., representing the Second District (eastern half) since 1961. He is a lawyer, receiving his LL.B. in 1951 from George Washington University. Speaking to Representative HALLECK, minority leader, he said: "I will be with you on most issues. But on others I won't be, because I am just not that liberal."

F. BRADFORD MORSE

A Republican from Lowell, Mass., representing the Fifth District since 1961. A lawyer, he served as attorney for the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 1953-54; executive assistant to Senator SALTONSTALL, 1955-58; and deputy administrator of Veterans' Affairs, U.S. Government, 1958-60. He has called for a reorganization of this country's foreign policy machinery and personnel to include more emphasis on executive ability in recruiting new members for the Foreign Service. He concurs with the Perkins and Herter reports, including the recommendation for an academy.

NOT 1 PENNY TO CUBA

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible that the United Nations should give a single penny to Cuba under the circumstances as presently exist. And it is the worst kind of sophistry for anyone connected with the United Nations to try to say that this is not money, at least in part, produced by the taxpayers of the United States. We all know that 40 percent of the money that goes into the U.N. special fund is contributed by American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, this ought to put the Members of Congress on notice. If this sort of thing is to be persisted in, the United Nations should get not another stinking penny from the Congress of the United States for the support of any part of that outfit.

MIGRATORY LABOR PROBLEM

(Mr. BENNETT of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years last past, I have introduced at the various sessions of Congress legislation dealing with the migratory labor problem. It is my opinion that this problem should be primarily faced by the enactment of a moderate and conservative type of minimum wage law, because this puts the burden where it should be, upon those who produce the products and sell them and upon the consumer, rather than upon the general taxpayers of the United States. This is just as we do in other things in our economy. Several weeks ago I reintroduced such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced other legislation, this being along the lines of legislation which we passed last year which contained the idea of using general taxation to meet some of the problems of the migratory labor problem.

The first measure I have introduced today would benefit both growers and migrant laborers by assisting the States in establishing day-care services for children of these workers. It is my understanding that grower groups support this legislation and it is my hope it can be enacted this session. The bill authorizes \$750,000 for matching grants to States to provide and operate these centers, which would not only provide supervision for the children whose parents work in the fields but relieve growers of a safety and efficiency problem presented by the presence of these young nonworking children.

The next bill would provide \$2 million annually for 4 years to help improve sanitation facilities for migrant workers. Many growers have tried to remedy this very serious health problem but have often been prevented from doing so by lack of adequate financing. This measure would give assistance in the construction or renovation of sanitation facilities and provide funds for surveys by States lacking adequate data concerning the need for these facilities.

The third bill would deal with what all have recognized as abuses by the so-called crew leader or middleman recruiter between the workers and the farm employer. It would require a license for these contractors which would be revoked if they committed such acts in connection with their work as, first, lying to workers about wages, hours, or working conditions; second, breaching agreements with farm employers; third, breaching agreements with migrant workers; and, fourth, being convicted under a State or Federal law relating to gambling, prostitution, alcoholic liquors, or narcotics.

The fourth bill would insure that in all future legislation, problems, and projects in this field—the voice of all interested groups, farm employer, labor and others—would be heard and contribute to possible solutions. I have been impressed by the concern already shown not only by the public, but growers and representatives of migrants alike for improvement. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in this effort.

This legislative package is a moderate and comprehensive approach to the extremely difficult problems of growers and their employees.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this Congress can come to grips with this very important subject matter, and do something in this field, whether through the legislation which I have introduced, or whether through some other legislation which may be brought forth by others at this session of Congress.

OUR NATION'S YOUTH—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 66)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the Presi-

dent of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"The youth of a nation," said Disraeli, "are the trustees of posterity." The future promise of any nation can be directly measured by the present prospects of its youth. This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities. Such attributes as energy, a readiness to question, imagination, and creativity are all attributes of youth that are also essential to our total national character. To the extent that the Nation is called upon to promote and protect the interests of our younger citizens, it is an investment certain to bring a high return, not only in basic human values but in social and economic terms. A few basic statistics will indicate the nature and proportion of our need to make this investment.

This is still the greatest nation in the world in which a child can be born and raised. His freedom, his security, his opportunity, his prospects for a full and happy life are greater here than any place on earth. We do not conceal the problems and imperfections which still confront our youth—but they are in large part a reflection of the growing number of youth in this country today.

The annual birth rate since 1947 has been 30 percent higher than it was in the 1930's. As a result, the number of youth under 20 rose from 46 million in 1945 to 70 million in 1961, increasing from 33 percent to 39 percent of the total population in that period. At present birth rates, they will number 86 million by 1970. We are a young nation, in every sense of the word.

This onrushing tide of young persons has overcrowded our education system, from the grade schools to the high schools, and is now beginning to overflow our colleges, our graduate schools, and the labor market. This year the number of persons 16 years of age will be more than a million greater than last year, for an increase of 39 percent. And in terms of the number of youths in the potential labor market bracket, ages 14 to 24, the amount of the increase in this decade over the previous decade—some 6 million youths—is nearly 15 times as high as the increase which occurred in the 1950's. Overcrowded educational facilities are a familiar problem. Youth unemployment is an increasingly serious one.

Unemployment among young workers today is 2½ times the national average, and even higher among minority groups and those unable to complete their high school education. During the 1960's 7½ million students will drop out of school without a high school education, at present rates, thereby entering the labor market unprepared for anything except the diminishing number of unskilled labor openings. In total, some 26 million young persons will enter the job market for the first time during this period, 40 percent more than in the pre-

vious decade. Already out-of-school youths age 16 to 21, comprise only 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed. During the school months of 1962 there were on the average 700,000 young persons in this age category out of school and out of work.

Other new or growing problems demand our attention. Our young people are raised in a more complex society than that experienced by their parents and grandparents. Nearly two-thirds are now reared in metropolitan or suburban settings, unlike the rural and smalltown societies of an earlier era. One family in five moves each year. One-third of the labor force now consists of women, 36 percent of whom are mothers with children under 18.

In the last decade, juvenile delinquency cases brought before the courts have more than doubled, and arrests of youths increased 86 percent until they numbered almost 1 million arrests a year in 1960, 15 percent of all arrests.

While new problems arise, old problems remain. Young people are particularly hard hit by the incidence of poverty in this country—where, despite a rapid average increase in disposable income and living standards, the 20 percent of the population at the bottom of the economic ladder still receives only 5 percent of personal income, the same as in 1944.

Rich or poor, too many American children—while taller and heavier than their parents—are still not achieving the physical fitness necessary for maximum performance. Data from the National Health Survey in 1958 show that 4 million children and youth under age 24 had one or more chronic health defects. In a recent survey of 200,000 schoolchildren in grades 4 through 12, nearly one-third failed minimum physical achievement tests and over 75 percent failed to reach satisfactory levels in a more comprehensive physical performance test. Although infant mortality has decreased 75 percent since 1900, the decline has leveled off in the last 10 years, and our rate is still higher than that, for example, of Sweden. Some States have an infant mortality rate double that of others. Ten other countries have a higher average life expectancy span than our own. The lack of adequate medical, educational and cultural opportunity is reflected in the grim statistics on 5 million mentally retarded, discussed in an earlier message, and in the 43 percent rejection rate among selective service inductees. Even during the Second World War, when physical and mental standards were not as high, 30 percent, or over 5 million young men, in the 18-37 age group failed their induction examinations.

These figures relate, of course, only to the problems that remain, without stressing the gains we have made. These gains have been very great indeed. As a nation we can be proud of all that we have done for our youth—in improving their opportunities for education, health, employment, recreation and useful activity. All Americans recognize that our children and youth are our most important asset and resource. But there are

2170

his family and many friends present at the services.

"Sincerely,

"HUGH SCOTT."

(Telegram received from Edward H. Cushman, as follows:)

"Regret inability to attend McGranery memorial service. Please convey our sincere condolences to Regina."

"EDWARD H. CUSHMAN."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INCREASE OF CRIME IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

(Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newsletter by the Honorable THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, of Mississippi.)

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in recent weeks about lawlessness and crime in our Nation's Capital. In this connection, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newsletter by my very able friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Democrat, of Mississippi. I am sure you will find it most interesting and enlightening.

In addition, I am including a brief statistical report which appeared in the February 18, 1963, Issue of U.S. News & World Report, entitled "Crime and Immorality—Some Hard Facts About Washington, D.C."

IN THE NEWS

(By Congressman ABERNETHY)

Washington, your Capital, capital of the free world, city beautiful, and said to be the citadel of democracy, is now more often referred to as a jungle. Gripped in a reign of lawlessness, Washingtonians dare not frequent most sections after dark. Even behind barred windows and bolted doors a restful night is difficult.

Among its 22,675 crimes last year—Increase of almost 7,000 in 5 years—were the stabbing of a Congressman's secretary as she knelt alone and prayed in a Capitol Hill church. In the same neighborhood another secretary was mugged, thrown to earth, beaten and robbed; a Congresswoman escaped a hoodlum's attack but was robbed; and a marauder broke into and entered a former Congressman's home, abused his wife, left her with a broken arm and robbed. Two years ago one of my own page boys was attacked and robbed within 4 blocks of the Capitol. Offenses are high, convictions few and executions for murder or rape are negligible—only two in 10 years. Police are hindered by local court decisions which make it quite easy for criminals to beat the rap. This situation has been compounded by a recent order of the city Commissioners, denying police the right to hold a suspect for investigation which makes it much easier for the guilty to escape.

Local papers at long last are reporting a lack of discipline in the public schools, a situation existent for years but which school administrators, city fathers, and local press have either denied or refused to admit. The big race riot of last fall, which caused them to emerge from stoic silence, broke out following the city championship game when an all Negro football team lost to an all white team. Future championship contests were promptly canceled, leaving the Nation's Capital, the exemplary city, to be the only city in America which cannot with safety risk the staging of a championship high school football game.

One Washington newspaper has just referred to the crime situation as a "tawdry story." These are nothing more than just nice words but at least they portend a bit of progress on the part of a few to speak out and face up. The Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Senate Chaplain and prominent Protestant minister, has just said, "Terrorism grips all sections of the most prominent city in the world." He said, "Crippling fear has invaded the streets * * * no woman dare walk alone after dark * * * the time has come to bear down." A high State Department official said he had "lived in foreign cities" but none "as lawless as Washington." He said he would respond to a knock at night only after "looking through a crack." He plead for another 1,000 policemen. Good for him.

Washington is not only a leader in crime. From its 400 liquor store outlets and several thousand taverns and cocktail bars the city leads the Nation in per capita consumption of alcohol. On the Holy Sabbath many sections bear evidence of a rowdy Saturday night—streets littered with trash, bottles and broken glass; jails filled with punks and drunks; and hospital waiting rooms filled with victims of the switchblade. Yes, all of this as the elite and would-be elite parade through the National Gallery of Art for a cultural view of Leonardo da Vinci's Mona Lisa.

In the midst of this state of high crime, race riots and littered mess, whites are fleeing to the environs of nearby Maryland and Virginia, fast restoring this city to a segregated status. The Department of Justice has not yet resorted to a means of forcing these white folks to stay put and live in this integrated mess. No civil rights suits have been filed, no citations for contempt, there is no military occupation, no hell-keepers checking from above, no aerial mapping, and not much law enforcement. They are as quiet as can be down in the Department of Justice. In fact, most of the higher-ups down there have fled to Virginia, too.

There is, however, a move on foot to enlarge the Police Department, to shore up its Canine Squad, to tighten antiloitering laws, curb gun totin', impose a curfew on juveniles, loosen court decisions which "hog-tie" the Police Department and some other curative steps. At long last there is some genuine recognition of the lawless cesspool which exists in this Capital City. Of course, there are still many who refuse to face up, who contend the situation is only a social problem. And, they lay it all on the Congress for not having given the city more money.

Oh yes, there are a few streets which have not yet been enveloped into the jungle, but given time at the present pace it won't be long.

One need not wear an armor of steel on visiting Washington; but if he ventures an after dark stroll this mode of dress is recommended.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

CRIME AND IMMORALITY—SOME HARD FACTS ABOUT WASHINGTON, D.C.

CRIME: ON THE RISE

Among the 16 U.S. cities with 500,000 to 1 million population, Washington last year ranked: First in aggravated assaults; second in robberies; fourth in murders; and sixth in housebreaking.

In terms of the increase in crime—1961 over the 1958-60 average, the record shows this: United States as a whole up 14 percent, Washington, D.C., up 41 percent.

Of all persons arrested in Washington for serious crimes last year, 84.6 percent were Negroes.

In the total population of Washington, 54.8 percent are Negroes.

BABIES: 1 OUT OF 5 ILLEGITIMATE

Washington leads all other big cities in the rate of illegitimate births. The Washington rate: 210 out of every 1,000 live births in 1961.

Few other cities show a rate even half that high. Of 4,251 illegitimate children born in Washington in 1961, 3,893 were non-white, 358 white.

Girls in Washington public schools, ages 12 to 15, gave birth to 265 illegitimate babies during the last school year—250 nonwhite, 15 white. The count, by ages of the mothers: 12-year-olds, 5 babies; 13-year-olds, 35 babies; 14-year-olds, 112 babies; 15-year-olds, 113 babies.

VENEREAL DISEASE: A MAJOR PROBLEM

Even among schoolchildren, venereal disease has become widespread in Washington. In the age group 15 to 19, the venereal rate is 5,728 per 100,000 population. National average: 416 per 100,000 in this age group.

AGRICULTURAL AID GRANTED TO CUBA

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the announcement that the United Nations decided yesterday to grant agricultural aid to Cuba is an extremely unwelcome and discordant action. It puts the United Nations and the United States at odds over policy toward Cuba.

The U.S. official position is that it has been and is opposed to the granting of the funds for this particular project even though it was originally approved in May, 1961. I support fully the U.S. position. The United States must continue to oppose this and similar projects and use its influence within the United Nations to achieve our objectives.

The United States did not push for a vote on this issue with the Governing Council because obviously it did not have the votes to stop the allocation of funds based on earlier approval of the project.

The U.S. position in opposition to the project is understandable. What is difficult to understand, however, is the position of the other nations who favor the granting of the funds for this project to Cuba. The Communist Government of Cuba refused to cooperate with the United Nations in the recent crisis concerning the on-site inspection for the determination that all offensive missiles have been removed. In view of this fact, and since the unresolved issue of determination can only be solved by on-site inspection, a big question mark on the threat to peace and security remains; the possibility of this threat is in direct conflict with the efforts of the United States and the United Nations and, accordingly, while this condition persists, there does not seem to be much logic to the positions of the other nations who seek to improve Cuban economic conditions by providing the funds on a 6-month test basis for a Cuban crop diversification program.

I fully support the investigation of this and related issues which has been undertaken in the other body and announced by Senator CHURCH. This is a matter in which all of us—the Foreign Affairs Committee which has jurisdiction and

He was a man of unquestioned integrity and not only great energy but very great industry, because he really went to work when he became a judge of this court. He had a great deal of work to do, and he turned it out, so I can second everything that has been said. I didn't know him as well as Judge Bolger or some of the others, but I knew him quite well in connection with our official position, and I did form a very, very high opinion of him and I certainly felt very badly when I heard of his recent death.

Judge CLARY. Thank you, Judge Kirkpatrick.

There is a circuit judge here who likewise was one of the finest judges ever to sit on any court in the country. He was supposed to be up here with us but was delayed, and I am going to ask whether Judge Ganey will not say a few words.

Judge GANEY. Chief Judge Clary and my former colleagues, I really had no knowledge that the chief was going to call on me, or I should have sat down for a few moments and recorded some of the very happy recollections I had of former Judge McGranery. He occupied a chamber next to mine, and on many occasions we traded opinions, and we sometimes didn't agree, but with all our differences of opinion with respect to some things, we agreed in most. We had a very, very happy association together.

I could go on and laud Jim McGranery, but were I to do this I think it would dim the luster of those beautiful tributes that have been paid to him by those who have just preceded me. However, I should be ungracious if not remiss if I did not extend to Mrs. McGranery, Regina Clark McGranery, and her lovely children the generous sympathy and deepest regrets from the court of appeals at his passing.

Thank you.

Judge CLARY. Thank you very much, Judge Ganey.

One part of Judge McGranery's distinguished life has not been touched upon, and that is his membership in the Caveat Club and the fun he had at the inner meetings of the Caveat Club.

It certainly is a real tribute to the memory of Judge McGranery that we have here today the president judge of the Orphans Court of Philadelphia and vice chancellor of the Caveat Club, Judge Charles Klein, the chairman of the board, Walter Gibbons, Judge Winnet, Mr. Barton, Mr. Wobensmith, Jerry Walker, Jim Mallie, and others. A lot of fun was had together and work was done together at those meetings, and I thank all of you gentlemen for attending this memorial service to our late colleague.

Judge Wood has already expressed his deep sorrow to Mrs. McGranery for his inability to be here, and Judge Body has also asked me to express his regrets that he can't be with us today, Mrs. McGranery. Judge Grim, however, did drop me a note. Judge Grim was unable to be here, and he wrote as follows:

"Since I shall be unable to be present at the court session this Friday in honor of Judge McGranery, I am taking this opportunity to write to you about it.

"Please express to Mrs. McGranery and the fine McGranery children my condolences for their great loss and my regret at my inability to attend the special court session.

"Judge McGranery was a very fine and vigorous judge and a thorough gentleman. His presence on this court brought honor to it. It was a real pleasure and honor to me to have served with him.

"Sincerely,

"ALLAN."

Of the judges nearest to Judge McGranery, one had adjoining chambers the other way from Judge Ganey's, and I refer to our beloved colleague Judge Welsh. Judge Welsh on his departure from Philadelphia handed me this letter:

"The date for the memorial to Judge McGranery has not been fixed as yet. As you know I will not be able to be present due to my visit to my home in Bermuda. As you will be presiding on the bench I am asking you to explain to the family and the friends of Jim why the judge, senior, in age, is not present. It would be the last worldly tribute that I could extend to him.

"Jim filled a very unique place in my own life's history and experience. The difference of some 20 years in tenure was never a gap nor a bar to our mutual respect and affection.

"There will be many present in the courtroom who will go on record as to his qualifications, attainments and performances in his numerous activities. You knew him before I did and as a younger man; I knew him after he had matured and was writing his life's history by his deeds. Between the two of us we span his career from the cradle to the grave. He and I had some of the strongest ties that can join two mature active spirits together in harmony and friendship. I like to think of the day he came into our court family. We had both served in the Congress, but at different times; we had adjoining chambers; we had many experiences in the political world on opposite sides, it is true, but of the same general character and purpose; we had mutual friends and some not so friendly toward either of us. But I particularly enjoyed his alert mind; his grasp on the realities of life; his freedom from bunk and hypocrisy. He never mouthed virtue to alay it on the altar of fake performance. In my long career at the bar and my close association with judges as prosecutor and associates, I can truly say I never knew a judge to be more dedicated to securing justice, although at times I felt that his zeal for justice, as he understood it, was such as would have been moderated if circumstances and public currents were different. I always felt that that was one of the reasons why he was willing to give up the judicial duties, for the battle in the area was not subject to the ethics and limitations imposed on a judge. Perhaps my own nature and weakness enables me to understand this characteristic in him.

"But now he has gone from our midst. But, Tom, the word 'gone' is a relative term. It is true, his physical presence is gone; no more shall we see his sprightly form or hear his cheery speech. That is due to his change from the mortal to the immortal. But the real Jim, the Jim that we saw, heard and loved, is not the Jim that lies in Arlington. That shall molder away to dust. And it is no fantasy of the imagination to say to you that on account of the lessons brought about by the sorrows of life, its heartbreaks of the natural and the intense joys of the spiritual, that I feel that what left Jim when his spirit took its flight, is the Jim I shall see with my own spiritual eyes in a very few years, and perhaps less. There is neither time nor space in the realm of heartbeats and as I say goodbye to Jim today, in a very short time I will say hello and we will not be strangers to each other and I would not write this way to you, Tom, if I thought you did not understand. My heart goes out to Regina and the family and we remember them in our prayers. May the darkness of the Christmas of 1962 be but the prelude to the spiritual illumination of 1963 and the future years for them all.

"Best wishes to you, Tom.

"Sincerely yours,

"GEORGE A. WELSH."

We have also been honored today by the presence of Mrs. McGranery, her three children, and Judge McGranery's family.

I see here many of the lawyers who knew him, Jim Masterson is here. The Register of Wills of Philadelphia I see is here, and on

the bench with us today we have two distinguished visitors from other districts, the chief judge of New Jersey, who sits on my left, and the distinguished judge from the southern district of New York, Judge Wilfred Feinberg, who served early in Judge McGranery's career on the bench as his law clerk, and I am sure that it gave Judge McGranery just as much pleasure when Bill Feinberg was appointed to the bench as I had when Judge Luongo was appointed; who now honors the bench of this court.

I have been asked by all my colleagues who are here today to express to Mrs. McGranery and the family their sincere regret at the passing of a gentleman who was a colleague of ours for a number of years.

The eastern district of Pennsylvania came into being by reason of the act of Congress of September 24, 1789. The first judge was appointed on September 30, 1789, Francis Hopkinson. The 19th in succession to Francis Hopkinson was appointed a judge on the 7th of August 1946, James P. McGranery. We understand, of course, that the District Court of the United States in its earlier days and until the Judiciary Act of 1912 was concerned primarily with admiralty, criminal, and bankruptcy. We do know, however, that every one of the district court judges sat in the circuit and heard, in addition to those, all of the civil cases which were filed in the district.

Judge McGranery, as has been said, has served this court and served it well. It has a long and honorable history, and he added luster to the history of this court. It was a pleasure for me and to all of us to have served with him. He was a fine gentleman of complete integrity, and I can echo everything that Judge Welsh has said in that beautiful tribute to him, that he hated humbug and hypocrisy. He left us on a challenging assignment, and while many years ago, over 10 years ago, we ceased hearing his booming hello and his wonderful sense of humor at our meetings, we have been in contact from time to time, and we rejoiced in his success in his practice in Washington and we were delighted every Christmas to receive that wonderful card that Mr. Gray spoke about showing his growing and wonderful family.

Jim has gone, but his memory will live long in the annals of this court and everywhere that Jim served in public life.

We are taught early that there are four reasons for existence and only four in this world: To know God, to love Him, and to serve Him. That, Judge James P. McGranery did to the utmost. The ultimate aim of life, we are taught, is to be happy with God forever in heaven. That he is now fulfilling that destiny is our fond hope and prayer, and as we come to the close of this ceremony, on behalf of all the judges here assembled, Regina and children, I extend our deepest sympathy, and I know that you, the children, and Jim will have our prayers.

I direct that a transcript of this proceeding be made, filed of record in the court, and copies furnished the family of the late Judge McGranery. The original letters which I have here, one also from Senator Scott, who called to express his deep regret that he couldn't be here, I direct be attached to the copy to be furnished Mrs. McGranery.

The court will now stand adjourned. (Adjourned at 12:45 p.m.)

(The letter received from Senator HUGH SCOTT reads as follows:)

"DEAR TOM: I regret so much that my Senate business commitments in Washington will prevent me from attending the memorial services for our longtime friend, James P. McGranery.

"We all miss him greatly, and it is most fitting that his memory be observed in these proceeding. I extend my warm sympathy to

1963

the Members of this House—will continue to be vitally interested. It would appear timely to have a complete reassessment of the U.S. positions in the specialized programs of the United Nations.

This recent act by the Governing Council of the 18-nation United Nations Special Fund is symbolical of the difficulty of the U.S. position in the world of today. We cannot control the direction or the destiny of all sovereign nations; while we exercise tremendous influence in the United Nations, and should do so, we certainly by no means positively control the direction and the decisions of the United Nations. This control issue is symbolical of the daily and continual paradox of the necessity to exist with other nations on one hand and win the obvious struggle in which we are engaged on the other.

The difficulty will not be resolved, nor the paradox removed, however, if the United States, as some people suggest, were to withdraw into complete isolation or to withdraw from the United Nations. Walking out or walking away is no way to win this struggle or any other. So, while we do not like what has happened and have every right to be angered, disgusted, and frustrated, we must resolve not to let this cloud our judgment as to what is best in the eventual long-range interest for the United States and the free world.

It could very well be that we should withdraw, or limit, or make conditional our participation in the special funds or specialized agencies in the United Nations. It may be that we should propose and undertake definite new policy positions. There may be other alternatives. All our participation is on a continuing, flowing, moving, day-to-day basis, requiring constant reexamination and reassessment. We must do this if our ultimate objective is worthy and is ever to be reached.

Therefore, this particular issue and the general problem must always be placed in the perspective and in the context of the achievement of the U.S. ultimate objective—the settlement of disputes among nations without war, but with honor; the victory of freedom over slavery in a peaceful world composed of sovereign and independent countries, politically stable and economically viable.

AGRICULTURAL AID TO CUBA

(Mr. SELDEN (at the request of Mr. FASCELL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, United Nations plans to provide economic project aid to the Castro regime constitute flagrant contempt for the inter-American policy laid down at Punta del Este.

The United States and other nations of the Western Hemisphere are committed to a policy of economic sanction against Castro. The United Nations, by its proposed Food and Agriculture Organization project, will undermine and nullify the policies of the Organization of American States.

There has been much talk in recent months concerning the United Nations venturing into policy areas where it does not belong. This is just such an instance. I feel that we should now seriously reappraise our financial role in supporting U.N. policies which run counter to our own solemn hemispheric commitments.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this session of Congress I introduced H.R. 1120, a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Basically, this bill provides for the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget, to be composed of 16 members as follows: 9 members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and 7 members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

This joint committee would have authority to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the Federal Government. Its functions would include study and analysis of the details of individual program operations and of the actual administration of these programs to insure that current practice conforms with legislative authorization. The committee would make its findings available to the Appropriations Committees and other committees of both Houses as well as to individual Members of Congress. Along with this, it would recommend such changes in existing laws which might be instituted to bring about greater efficiency and economy in Government. Furthermore, it would report to the Appropriations Committees its findings relative to total budget requirements which would meet our defense and civilian needs and yet be consistent with sound fiscal policy. It could also recommend that joint hearings be held by the two Appropriations Committees without affecting the independence of committee deliberations and decision.

This measure is not a new one. Repeated unsuccessful attempts have been made during the past 12 years to secure legislation setting up a Joint Committee on the Budget. Provision for the creation of such a committee was embodied in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. This act authorized the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, the Senate Committee on Finance, and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses "to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year." This provision has never been

carried out, due primarily to the impracticality of having such a large number of persons from these four committees serve on this committee. Since the passage of this act attempts have been made to amend it by providing for a Joint Committee on the Budget which would be composed of a limited number of members from the appropriations committees of the two Houses. The Senate has on a number of occasions given its sanction to such proposals, but the House has withheld its support in every instance.

The objective of my bill is to bring about an improvement in appropriations procedures which will produce real savings and economies in Federal spending programs.

The need for such economies is imperative in these days of rising Federal costs when deficits are mounting and our national debt has reached an unprecedented height. The most recent budget presented by President Kennedy for the fiscal year 1964 calls for programs which will cost \$98.8 billion—exceeding expenditures made in any previous year, even the peak years of World War II. By far the largest area of expenditure—\$55.4 billion—of course, will go to maintain a strong national defense. Defense needs, however, which are so urgent in these days of world crises must be met, and we cannot afford to risk our priceless freedom for the sake of a balanced budget. Similarly, there are many essential domestic programs which are expanding to meet growing needs of our citizens for housing, education and health services.

The necessity of finding ways and means of economizing is all the more urgent in view of the President's recent proposals for tax reduction and revision which are aimed at providing additional stimulus to our sluggish economy. If such proposals are enacted into law they will cost the Government some \$10 billion in revenues annually and will thus widen the growing gap between revenues and expenditures and will add to the burden of our national debt which today stands at \$304 billion. Enactment of my bill will constitute an important step toward bringing spending more in line with revenues and eliminating annually recurring deficits.

The vastness and complexity of budgetary operations make it impossible for the two appropriations committees adequately to study and scrutinize individual programs. With a mere handful of employees as contrasted with the staff of nearly 500 employed by the Bureau of the Budget and thousands more of fiscal and technical specialists employed by the executive agencies, these two committees are severely handicapped in analyzing the thousands of programs for which funds must be approved each year. They are forced to rely for the most part on reports and testimony presented by the executive agencies whose primary objective is commonly obtaining larger sums each year to promote their own particular programs. The creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget would provide a permanent nonpolitical corps

of technical and professional experts who could impartially evaluate the various programs as they come up for consideration. The overburdened appropriations committees would thus be better informed and would be in a better position to make recommendations for the elimination of wasteful practices and for the cutting back of those programs where such may be possible without endangering our national security and domestic welfare.

In studying and evaluating all phases of the budget process, such a committee would be in a better position to consider the budget as a whole rather than in piecemeal fashion as is now the current practice. It could develop a fiscal program aimed at keeping expenditures within the bounds of anticipated revenues.

Congress already has benefited from services provided by joint committees in the fields of atomic energy, taxation, economic policy, and so forth. Just as there is now a joint tax committee to study revenue questions under consideration, the creation of a similar joint committee to study the programs for which billions of dollars must be appropriated annually would bring about greater efficiency and economies in this area and would render an invaluable service to our Nation's taxpayers.

I am persuaded also that such a committee will accomplish much in bringing about more harmonious working relationships between the appropriations committees of both Houses.

Enactment of H.R. 1120 is now long overdue. I am convinced that its passage will contribute much toward better management of our taxpayer's money. It will enable the Congress to find many areas where waste and extravagance can be eliminated and will return to this body a measure of the control over the national purse strings which it has lost. I, therefore, urge your early consideration and affirmative action on this bill.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the Record of February 7 contains several minor typographical errors in my remarks which appear on pages 1874-1879. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record may be corrected as follows:

Page 1877, column 3, line 49, for "minimum" read "medium".

Page 1878, column 1, 22d line from the bottom, insert a period after the word "gravel" and capitalize the "o" in "of".

Page 1878, column 1, 21st line from the bottom, delete the quotation marks and the period after "course", and insert a comma, and substitute a lower case "t" in "The".

Page 1878, column 1, 15th line from the bottom, insert quotation marks after the word "it".

Page 1878, column 2, line 8, for "subject" read "subsequent".

Page 1878, column 2, line 12, at the end of the line, delete the question mark and insert a period.

Page 1878, column 2, line 38, before "concrete" insert "word".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF TV PROGRAMS

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received complaints from many citizens with regard to the "Today" show, which was presented on February 8 by the National Broadcasting Co. Although I did not see this television program myself, detailed descriptions have been forwarded to me.

According to those who contacted me, this program was not merely in poor taste but reflected upon the character and integrity of the Governors of two States and a former Member of this body, now deceased, who saved the Un-American Activities Committee from oblivion and who rendered outstanding services not only in the development of our Nation but in pointing out the dangers which were building up, many of which have come to pass.

Further, it is my information this program ridiculed the Lord's Prayer and was an affront to the religious beliefs of God-fearing Americans.

Certainly, the privilege of going into the homes of the American people through the medium of television is one which should carry with it full responsibility for decency, which this program did not have. The right and privilege of television broadcasts should be extended or permitted to continue only upon acceptance of responsibility to see that such programs are educational, wholesome, and not destructive.

I have joined with others of my colleagues in a request for a full investigation and appropriate action by the Federal Communications Commission at the earliest possible moment.

PROTECTION OF LABOR UNION MEMBERS

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the growth of our national economy and the welfare of our citizens depend on the continued strength of American productivity.

During the past few years we have seen our economy weakened, our defense effort hobbled, and our access to a free press denied, by repeated and lengthy strikes, many of them contrary to the wishes of a majority of the members of the striking union.

The right of labor union members to arbitrate, and, if necessary, to strike, for better working conditions or benefits, is an essential and important part of American freedom. I will always defend that basic right.

But it is time that the individual rights of union members be strengthened. They must be guaranteed a voice in determining whether or not to strike.

It is time to protect employers from needless production losses arising out of strikes called without majority vote by union workers.

It is time to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce.

It is time—past time—to guarantee every American labor union member the right to an impartial secret strike ballot.

Toward that end I am today introducing a bill to protect all labor union members as well as all other Americans, from economic penalties imposed by strikes called without the majority consent of the union workers involved.

A majority vote by secret ballot is all that my bill provides.

THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, it is highly fitting and appropriate that today's opening prayer was given by a Lithuanian priest in observance of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's independence this coming Saturday.

When the Lithuanian nation declared its independence on February 16, 1918, the people of that little nation reached a goal they had been seeking for many years. For 120 years, from 1795 to 1915, they had been under Russian domination; then during World War I, they finally gained freedom. But this freedom lasted only to World War II, when the nation was overrun by the Red army and again fell under Russian domination.

The United States recognized independent Lithuania on July 27, 1922, and has never given any recognition to the incorporation of this brave nation into the Soviet Union. We continue to maintain diplomatic relations with the former independent Government which has a legation in Washington, D.C. Lithuania and all the Baltic States have had their sovereignty violated and their freedom suppressed by the Soviet Union. The aggression and tyranny which the Baltic States have suffered is a sharp contrast to the freedom of the United States and the Western nations.

On Saturday, the free world will observe this anniversary of Lithuanian independence, and Lithuanians all over the world will join in prayerful observance of this commemorative date. Though the Lithuanians have again been living under the bondage and tyranny of the Soviet Union for more than 20 years, they have never lost hope of freedom. This 45th anniversary of Lithuanian independence should be honored by every American who holds sacred the ideals of liberty and independence. We of the free world remain steadfast in our dedication to extend freedom to all the en-

February 14

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to give the gentleman such information as is available at this time.

Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are only two bills on the Consent Calendar as of this time. It is expected that we will have business later in the week, but I am not in a position to advise the gentleman in detail with respect to that yet, but we plan to do so on Monday if possible.

Mr. GROSS. But there will be some business next week?

Mr. ALBERT. Committees are meeting and we expect some business from at least one of the committees next week.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa would like to think that the House of Representatives will eventually get down to work.

Mr. ALBERT. It always does, eventually.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but unfortunately it is usually in September or October.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WHO ARE THE U.S. ALLIES IN THE CUBAN STRUGGLE?

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was Thomas Jefferson who warned the United States against entangling alliances. However, this Nation's policy goals are beginning to resemble a plate of spaghetti. While the United States, through its membership in the Organization of American States, continues to press for measures to tear communism down in Cuba, it also pays a large share of a special fund in the United Nations which only yesterday announced its intentions to build Cuba up.

Such vague reasoning is difficult for the American mind to understand. It was clear thinking, commonsense which made this country great, yet U.S. alliance with two international organizations which are diametrically opposed on the policy of one nation, namely Cuba, is absurd.

At this very moment, the OAS is engaged in a comprehensive study of the Cuban attempt to totally subvert the entire continent of South America. There is an abundance of evidence to attest that Castro's Cuba is a fountainhead for a Communist conspiracy of hemispheric proportions. Next week beginning February 18, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, Congressman SELDEN of Alabama, begins hearings on the extent of Castro's subversive activities.

Apologists for the U.N. decision argue that special fund projects must be free of political considerations. However, aside from the obvious fact that Castro's regime is of the blackest order, the Cuban Government is not entitled to this project on economic grounds. The project is supposedly to diversify Cuban agriculture and provide technical assistance but the recklessness of the Castro regime has destroyed Cuba's rich agricultural

economy and forced its agricultural technicians to flee Cuba and join the army of Cuban political exiles.

If it is technicians that Cuba needs, we have been told in recent months that Soviet technicians are plentiful in Cuba. If there are so many Soviet technicians, why must the United Nations now supply \$1.1 million worth of technical help to Communist Cuba?

If the U.N. aid programs are free of political ties, why then would the United Nations suspend its assistance program in Iran because of revolutionary upheaval in that country?

I urge that the U.S. Government make a careful review of its entangled spaghetti alliances.

In addition, the Congress of the United States acting in the name of the American people should refuse to appropriate any American dollars which might be used to finance the U.N. project in Cuba.

THE SOVIET OIL THREAT AND NEED FOR EFFECTIVE AMERICAN COUNTERMEASURES

(Mr. HUDDLESTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the economic war with the Soviet Union is getting hotter every day. The Soviets by long tradition have regarded trade as a legitimate tool in spreading the Communist doctrine. They are willing to undercut world prices of products if there is political advantage to the Soviet Union. As Russian Communist Party Chairman Nikita Khrushchev has said of his nation's trade policies:

We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons.

More than a year ago it became apparent that the Russians were making significant inroads into the markets of free world countries by the use of oil. Oil is sold at bargain rates for political reasons. Oil represents the most marketable export that the Soviet Union possesses and, further, they have a surplus of it. Russia is using oil to obtain and hold on to trade lines with free nations. With oil the Soviets are hoping to gain more and more trade with the free nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is alarming to report that in the last 6 years Russia has expanded her production of oil to 3 million barrels a day, second only to the U.S. oil production of about 7 million barrels per day. More alarming than that fact is the rising Red export of this oil. For instance, in 1953 the Soviets shipped 35,000 barrels a day to free world countries. In 1961 the Soviet Union was sending about 600,000 barrels of oil per day to free world markets. All indicators point to a continuation of this trend.

The Soviets have vast oil reserves and are developing them. In the Urals-Volga region there are new fields and in the older developed areas like Baku they are maintaining production. Offshore drilling in the Caspian Sea has uncovered significant new fields. While new oil re-

serves are being found in Russia, the Soviet demand for oil has not kept pace. This is principally because the Russians have few automobiles, only about 4 million, as compared to the United States' 76 million vehicles. The worldwide demand for oil is rising, especially in the new nations that are pushing crash programs of industrialization. Ghana and Pakistan are important Soviet oil markets in this category. Yet the older industrialized nations like Japan, Italy, and Germany are ideal customers and the Soviets are pushing into these markets whenever possible. They are using every method available.

Oil in the Soviet Union is a state-controlled monopoly. Prices are set by the state and in the export market these prices are set to accomplish short and long-term political goals of the Red slavemasters. It is reliably reported that the Soviets have actually sold oil at prices below the cost of production in the oil rich Middle East. Losses incurred in this trade are often passed on to Soviet oil markets in the captive satellite nations in the form of higher prices. In 1960 the free world price of Russian crude oil was 52 percent less than the price paid by captive markets in the Red satellite nations. By using facilities purchased by private companies the Soviets are able to save transportation costs. They will accept local money, whether or not it is convertible into reliable currencies, and extend long-range credit terms at attractive rates of interest. Additionally the Russians make barter arrangements—oil is traded for the staples of the country buying Soviet oil. With industrial nations the Soviets bargain for machine tools and needed production items.

Soviet gains in influence with free nations by using oil are indeed impressive. More than half the oil produced by the Russians this year will be sold to Western nations. Italy, Japan, Sweden, Iceland, Finland, Spain, India, and Cuba will buy most of the oil and are growing increasingly dependent on Russia for their supplies. Italy is acting as a re-exporter of Russian crude oil into the European Common Market area. All of this tends to endanger our alliances and normal trade.

That the Soviet Government is intent on increasing this highly successful oil export activity is attested to by the Soviet's 7-year plan for the years 1959-65. The program calls for the continued emphasis on all phases of oil development in Russia from oil production to distribution. Oil production is calculated to rise from 3 million barrels daily to 5 million barrels daily by 1965.

What are the dangers to nations that rely on supplies of Soviet oil? They are many and should be duly noted.

A nation that imports Soviet oil will more readily import Soviet ideas and Communist political influence.

A country that is reliant on Soviet export trade is more vulnerable to Communist pressure and threatened loss of markets. The Soviets have demonstrated how they use economic dependence as a political tool.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

No. 22

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. J. Walter Stanlevich, Saint Anthony Parish, Detroit, Mich., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, through whose grace Thy faithful are able to serve Thee with dignity and joy, bless this august body of Representatives who serve this Nation and its people. Lord, Thou hast given these United States a superabundance of blessings which, too often, we have ignored. Humbly we realize that we surpass all other nations of the world in material possessions; grant that we may continue to share our bounty with the less fortunate.

Although in Thy divine providence Thou hast deemed it wise to make us the mightiest of nations, Thou hast also taught us to extend a hand of friendship to those who are weak and downtrodden. Teach us, we beseech Thee, to always remember that might is not always right. Grant that by the keeping of Thy commandments, Thy justice and the love of our fellow man may persevere.

Today, as we commemorate the anniversary of Lithuania's brief independence, may we be reminded that she too, once was a mighty Nation and that her heroes were great. But now, in Thy inscrutable wisdom, Thou hast laid her low and are now testing her brave people under the yoke of a terrible oppressor. May this lesson of history teach us to rely upon Thee with greater zeal and constancy.

We pray Thee, most merciful Lord, to hasten the hour of deliverance and liberation to Lithuania and all other enslaved nations. And that having been purified through this frightful ordeal, Lithuania and her valiant children may once again freely serve Thee in the community of free nations. Finally, we implore Thee to bless and preserve this great Nation of the United States, of whom we are all so proud to be citizens. May it not only remain as a symbol of liberty, but also a bulwark against oppression and godlessness.

These things we ask of Thee through the merits and in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 11, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States No. 63-7.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 585, 79th Congress, had appointed Mr. CURTIS to be a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, vice Mr. DIRKSEN, resigned.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 5(a) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress, had appointed Mr. MILLER and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be members of the Joint Economic Committee, vice Mr. Bush and Mr. Butler, retired from the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit next week during general debate to hear evidence on the youth opportunities bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what committee is this?

Mr. PERKINS. It is the Subcommittee on Education considering the youth opportunities bill. We have four Cabinet members scheduled to appear, and we thought we would hear them while you were in general debate here in the House.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman take the microphone if he is going to transact committee business, so we may all know what is being proposed?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to accommodate the gentleman. My request is that the Subcommittee on Education be permitted to sit during general debate next week to take evidence on the Youth Opportunity Act.

Mr. GROSS. Is this the so-called Domestic Peace Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. This is not the so-called Domestic Peace Corps. This is with reference to the Youth Opportunities Act, which is patterned after the old Conservation Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for tomorrow may be transferred until Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, before this unanimous-consent request is granted, could we have some information as to the program for next week?

2105

1963

Once a nation is dependent upon Soviet oil sources, there is the real possibility of their raising the prices. With a state-controlled monopoly this can be done at will.

In the event of international emergency, how secure will Western nations, reliant on Soviet oil, react, since oil is necessary as a tool of modern warfare.

Soviet economic penetration of the Western alliance is an all too serious matter to be taken lightly. Mr. Speaker, what can be done to stem this Soviet trade offensive before it becomes a danger to world economic and political balance?

Certainly some of the steps that the United States can take are:

First. Development of national fuels policy by the United States. This matter is already under study by the Congress.

Second. Impress upon Western alliance nations, such as Italy, the dangers of dependence on Russian oil; and point out the true nature of the Soviet oil offensive.

Third. Greater use of the provisions of section 647 of Public Law 87-195 in getting U.S. foreign-aid countries to use free world supplies in their industrial development programs.

Fourth. Encourage free world nations to set restrictions quotas on the amount of Soviet oil imported.

Fifth. Suggest to consumer countries that in trading with the Russians only consumer goods be bartered—rather than strategic materials that increase the Communist potential for war.

These are just suggestions that have been made by competent observers who are concerned over the Soviet oil export policy. It is important for the United States to be alert to all shifts in the Soviet economic offensive, to determine the kinds of effective countermeasures which must be taken against them.

The Russians have issued the challenge to the free world to compete economically. With their surplus oil they are attempting to penetrate the Western alliance economically to bring about disunity and to use the resulting disunity for their devious political machinations. By diligently pursuing the countermeasures the United States can minimize the threat of Soviet economic and political penetration. The Soviets are depending on oil to gain for them further access to Western markets and subsequently opportunities for political activity. Additionally they need Western machine tools and manufactured products. Effective application of methods to negate the Soviet oil offensive will mean a resounding defeat for Russian hopes of expansion of their godless political system.

UNITED NATIONS AND CUBA

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations to grant an amount of economic assistance to the Government of Cuba is profoundly shocking to me, as I know it must be to most of the Members of Congress.

I fully realize, of course, that irresponsible attacks on the United Nations itself perform a grave disservice to the United States because in a truly vast majority of instances the decisions reached by the membership of that world body have been exactly in keeping with the official position of the United States on all major policy matters wherein our position has come in conflict with that of the Communist bloc.

Since the substantial majority of the members of the United Nations have almost invariably stood with us and against our competitors in the world ideological struggle, we should, of course, be at some pains to restrain ourselves from demagogery and to bridle our tongues against harsh, hasty, and intemperate statements.

It is difficult, however, to conceive of a more unfortunate or more ill-timed action than this decision of a United Nations committee which has just been reported. The fact that the dollar volume of aid involved is relatively small when compared with that involved with such programs in other nations, does not in any way diminish the symbolism of this unfortunate decision nor in any way alter the basic principle involved.

To grant any amount of economic aid whatever to Cuba seems utterly unthinkable. It is wholly inconsistent with everything for which we stand as a nation and totally inconsistent with the fundamental purposes embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

It is ironic indeed that such a decision to grant even this modicum of assistance to the Government of Cuba should come at this time when today we celebrate the national independence of Lithuania, another small nation which, like Cuba, has seen its lights of freedom snuffed out by the coarse hand of Communist tyranny and the flower of its liberty crushed under the iron boot of Communist imperialism.

It is ironic that such a decision should come at this time when just today we have had revealed to us an official report by a special security committee of the Organization of American States which concludes that a deliberate plot exists to overthrow free governments in Latin America, and that this plot is being directed from Cuba.

Our State Department has opposed the granting of any aid by the United Nations to the present Government of Cuba. Our official representatives in the United Nations have opposed it. It seems incumbent upon the Congress at this point to strengthen their hand by a clear and forceful demonstration of our profound shock and of our strong and active opposition to the granting of any such recognition or assistance to the outlaw government of Cuba, which seeks to subvert the security of the hemisphere and to menace the freedom of our good neighbors and which stands diametrically opposed to the interests of the United States.

Today I have written to our Secretary of State expressing the strength of my own conviction as one Member of Congress in this regard. May I suggest that other Members of Congress might well

join in doing likewise in order that those who represent us in the councils of the world might be armed and abetted in their dealings with other nations by having such incontrovertible proof of the overwhelming sentiment of the lawmaking body of this Government in forceful opposition to any such encouragement or assistance whatever to a government of the type that exists in Cuba.

UNITED NATIONS ACTION ON CUBA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the United Nations to engage in a 6-month trial run on a Cuban aid project adds a jarring note to the already pronounced discord over Cuba. The cost of the project intended to diversify Cuban agriculture will cost the United Nations \$1,157,600. The statement has been made that no U.S. funds are involved. But the fact remains that the United States is paying 40 percent of the cost of the U.N. Special Fund from which the Cuban project would be financed. The United States has fought the project since it was first proposed in 1961.

There is no way to differentiate between U.S. funds and other funds in U.N. projects. If this one is allowed to proceed, the United States will be in the position of contributing to the perpetuation of its own foes. General disintegration of Cuba's agriculture is in process. There should be firm resolve on the part of the United States to make no contribution to any U.N. fund which is used to thwart foreign policies of the United States.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, due to an oversight, I respectfully request that the permanent bound RECORD of February 7, 1963, be corrected by including the following proceedings in the U.S. District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in memory of the late Honorable James P. McGranery and that these proceedings be reprinted in the permanent RECORD of that date.

Mr. Speaker, the proceedings referred to are as follows:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA—PROCEEDINGS IN MEMORY OF HON. JAMES P. MCGRANERY, FORMER U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE AND FORMER ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES—PHILADELPHIA, PA., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1963, AT 12 O'CLOCK NOON

(Before Hon. Thomas J. Clary, Ch. J., presiding; Hon. William H. Kirkpatrick, Sr., J.; Hon. John W. Lord, Jr.; Hon. Francis L. Van Dusen; Hon. Joseph S. Lord, III; Hon. Abraham L. Freedman; Hon. Alfred L. Luongo; Hon. Thomas M. Madden, Camden, N.J.; and Hon. Winfred Feinberg, New York City)

Judge CLARY. This special session of the court has been called in memory of the Honorable James P. McGranery, who served as a judge of this court.

The court will now recognize the Honorable Hubert J. Horan, Jr. Mr. Horan.

Mr. HORAN. If Your Honors please, Mrs. McGranery, her sons and daughter, and the good people who are here this morning:

I had the honor of being what I consider a very intimate friend of Jim McGranery. I knew him when he was practicing law here in Philadelphia. I have the honor of having been one of three members of our bar who went down to speak on his behalf at the time he came up for confirmation by the U.S. Senate.

I also had the experience, which was rather unusual, of being chairman of a testimonial dinner for a man who belonged to an administration which was going out of power, the Democrats having been defeated in 1952, and after they had gone out of power this Bellevue Stratford ballroom and the rooms immediately connected with it were filled, up in the boxes and everywhere else, with people who had nothing except respect for Judge McGranery. Since he was going out with his party, they knew there was little he could do in the way of conferring favors, and in spite of that, the leaders of the bar and many people who were not members of the bar attended that dinner simply and solely to do him honor.

Judge McGranery was born in 1895. He came to the bar in 1928, having graduated from Temple University Law School. He was appointed in 1934 to the honorable position of chairman of the Registration Commission in the city of Philadelphia. He held that position until he went to Congress, and he served in Congress in the 75th, 76th, and 77th sessions and part of the 78th session.

He was appointed to the bench in 1946, and during his lifetime term he was asked by the President of the United States to give up the position that he held on the bench and to accept the post of Attorney General of the United States.

Every position that Judge McGranery occupied he filled with honor and distinction. I still remember my statement under oath before the Members of the Senate—because there were those who were taking the position, that he should not be confirmed—that I had known James McGranery for many years, had been against him in cases during the period in which he was trying cases in Philadelphia, and I never found him to utter anything that was double entendre or anything that was anything but the truth.

He has been honored by the church and by the state. He has received the Order of Merit from President Truman. He has been honored by the church by Pope John XXIII and Pope Pius XII in being made a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Gregory and a Papal Chamberlain. He likewise, in his active career, which really only started in 1928, filled an incredible number of positions. How he was able to do it is to me a mystery.

He was a member of the board of trustees of Immaculata College. He was a member of the boards of Temple University Law School and Villanova University in Philadelphia. He was a member of the boards of various other colleges, and just before his death he was elected a member of the board of trustees of the Catholic University in Washington and of the Shrine of Mary Immaculate. He received a medal from the Ancient Order of Hibernians as the most distinguished catholic gentleman in the country. He likewise received the De LaSalle medal, which was a medal for civil decency in government and decency in his private life.

The year 1928 was a turning point in his career. In 1939 there was another turning point in his career, when he was able to persuade the beautiful and accomplished Regina Clark to marry him. That helped him tremendously. With her help and aid he went right straight ahead.

There is nothing that anyone can say derogatory to him and still tell the truth. It was amusing to me, at the time that he was up for confirmation in the Senate, his appointment was questioned by some of the columnists in the United States; and the situation was that he went into the Department of Justice realizing the tremendous job that he had to do in limited time. These columnists claimed that he was going to brush dirt under the carpet. That was not what he did, and when he ceased being Attorney General there wasn't a single columnist who did not praise him for the wonderful work that he did.

He was an outstanding man. Being the strong character that he was, he, of course, made enemies. Any man who doesn't make some enemies is not much, and he made enemies of men who were vituperative and abusive. He held no rancor, he held no hatred of those men, and he was a truly great American.

During World War I he was a member of the Observation Corps of the U.S. Government in the Balloon Corps, and if anything could be more exposed and more like a sitting duck than that, it is impossible to conceive what it was.

We regret his passing, but I say to Jim McGranery, Jr., and Clark McGranery, and Regina McGranery that they have inherited something which is much greater than wealth. They have received an honorable name, a name that they have the duty to keep unspotted.

Thank you.

Judge CLARY. Thank you, Mr. Horan.

The court will now recognize the nestor of the legal profession in Philadelphia, the Honorable William A. Gray.

Mr. GRAY. I shall address the court, as is customary on other occasions, by saying, "If Your Honors please."

I know many of the things that Mr. Horan has directed his remarks to.

I shall not repeat them. They have been mentioned. But I shall speak of Jim McGranery as a lawyer. He was 20 years younger than I, and he was admitted to the bar much later than I was, but in Philadelphia I remember him because—and this has been said by Mr. Horan, but I repeat this—he was an honorable man. He was a man of integrity. He was a good lawyer, and I know that because I was cocounsel with him in several cases during the time that he spent in Philadelphia.

He left Philadelphia, as Your Honors know, and went to Washington as a Member of the Congress, and during his fourth term, he resigned to accept appointment from President Roosevelt as the Assistant to the Attorney General, and then in 1946, if I recollect the date correctly, he was appointed by the then President Truman to be a judge of this court, and in 1952, if I recollect that date correctly, President Truman took him from the bench and made him Attorney General.

I followed his career from the time he became a lawyer in the city of Philadelphia. I saw him on different occasions in Washington, but especially after he was Attorney General. Every time I went to Washington I visited him in his office. To me he was Jim; to him I was Bill. We lost a great man, a good lawyer.

We have been very closely in touch and for many years past we have exchanged Christmas greetings. That maybe is not unusual between friends, but every Christmas, even this last Christmas, prior to Christmas day, of course, I received from him his usual Christmas greeting, which contained a photograph of his children, all of which I have preserved at home.

God rest his soul.

Judge CLARY. Thank you, Mr. Gray.

We will next hear from a distinguished jurist and a very close personal friend of our

late beloved colleague, the Honorable Robert V. Bogler, judge of the orphans court of Philadelphia.

Judge BOLGER. If Your Honors please, I am especially grateful to you for extending me this honor this morning to appear before this distinguished Court to repay the honor that Jim McGranery bestowed upon me in letting me be his friend, his companion of about six different vacation trips, his best man when he was married, and godfather to his second child.

He had one of the greatest capacities for friendship that I have ever known, and second only probably to that of another mutual friend, James A. Farley. I met him first in the Democratic primary in 1927, when Democrats in Philadelphia numbered less than 20,000.

Many years ago I heard the phrase, "The joy is in the striving." There also appears in "As You Like It" the aphorism, "Sweet are the uses of adversity."

They are things that, in my opinion, epitomize a great deal of Jim McGranery's career. He came from the little people. He shared their vicissitudes, their struggles. They tell me that as a kid he was quite proficient with his fists—of course, only in self-defense—but he learned the motivations of these little people, and in conjunction with a firm belief in God, a profound belief in God, he became a fearless man in everything that he did. He loved life, he loved pleasure, he loved recreation, and he loved his friends. The lessons that he learned in his young life as a little person carried through with him, together with his love of God, later on in life when he became a big man.

On one of our trips we went abroad in 1939. We visited England, Ireland, and France. While we were in Ireland we were the guests of the late Joseph P. McGarity, who was, I suppose, the greatest Irish-American patriot of his time.

Jim was a great defender of equal rights.

I remember specifically when as a Congressman, his constituent, Marian Anderson, one of the greatest voices of all time, was being kept back in her career because of racial prejudice. She was refused the use of Convention Hall in Washington by one of the patriotic societies, and Jim made a speech on the subject on the floor of Congress chiding them that he was the son of an Irish immigrant and he had to remind these persons, these scions of American patriots, of their responsibilities as citizens.

He loved his country, as we know, and as Mr. Horan said, his marriage in 1939 to the beautiful and scholarly Regina Clark, an able lawyer in her own right, gave new direction to his life upward and onward to greater things and to complete fulfillment. I have said that the judge took great joy in the striving. Indeed he did so and was triumphant, so that today, while we are saddened by the terrific shock of his loss, we must express and record our joy in his abundant contributions to our society, to the service of God, to his family, and to his friends.

Judge CLARY. When Judge McGranery came to the bench of this court he served under one of the finest chief judges ever to grace the bench of the country, Judge Kirkpatrick, who is here today. I have asked Judge Kirkpatrick to say a few words.

Judge KIRKPATRICK. I was very happy to have Jim McGranery as one of the judges on the court while I was chief judge. I think the thing that impressed me more than anything else about Jim was indirectly referred to by Mr. Horan, his tremendous energy. He was a dynamic personality and a very magnetic personality. His whole manner was most attractive to others, and we worked along together very well indeed. I had the highest regard for him.

The project, which will get underway in 3 or 4 months, will provide technicians in animal husbandry, grasslands management, and plant pathology.

PUBLICATION POLICY REVIEW FORCED— UNESCO BOOKLET PROTESTS RISE

(By A. I. Goldberg)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 13.—Protests over a year-old UNESCO publication containing profuse claims about guarantees for racial and political equality in the Soviet Union have forced UNESCO to review its publication policy.

UNESCO is the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, based in Paris. It has the status of a specialized agency of the United Nations. Some conservative organizations in the United States have criticized it for its views on social and cultural problems.

The United States contributes nearly one-third of UNESCO's \$39 million annual budget. The Soviet Union pays about 15 percent.

The publication, written by a Soviet educator and a Soviet lawyer, asserted in one passage that "in 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which voluntarily joined the Soviet Union."

A U.S. source said the United States protested vigorously last April, shortly after the book was issued, and was told that a lack of arm policy directives rendered UNESCO powerless to deal with such cases.

A review committee, set up as a result of U.S. and other protests, is expected to report in April, the source said. The U.S. National Committee for UNESCO has submitted recommendations and criteria for stricter standards.

The new complaint—one of many, an informant said—came from the Assembly of Captive European Nations in New York. It is a group comprising political exiles from Eastern European countries, including the Baltic republics (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia), whose incorporation into the Soviet Union early in World War II has never been recognized by the United States, Britain and many other nations.

A letter from the assembly's president, George M. Dimitrov, appealed to Vittorino Veronese, UNESCO Director General, to halt distribution of the 106-page booklet. He called it "cheap Soviet propaganda, falling short of UNESCO objectivity," and termed it "harmful to the rights of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania."

The booklet was the third of a series of six planned by UNESCO in 1951 to study race discrimination. Now UNESCO officials are examining whether to continue with the series, an informant said.

The booklet was written by I. P. Tsamerian, described as a Soviet doctor of philosophy, and S. L. Ronin, a Soviet doctor of law. Titled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," it reiterated Soviet arguments frequently heard in U.N. debates that guarantees against race discrimination were written into the Soviet constitution.

At one place it said "the Soviet Union has solved the problem of nationalities," but acknowledged "this does not mean, of course, that a peak of perfection has been reached. The U.S.S.R. still contains backward elements among whom nationalist prejudices exist."

The booklet contended that the Bolshevik revolution for the first time gave Jews equal rights in the Soviet Union, said racial problems were solved because of Communist Party policy, and quoted Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's assertion that Jews "hold a worthy place" among those responsible for Soviet lunar rocket launchings.

In Washington, Republican National Chairman William E. Miller termed the booklet

"a gratuitous insult to Americans and the free world," and said in a statement that the Kennedy administration should demand that the United Nations repudiate the publication and order its withdrawal from circulation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator, the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs, of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for taking the prompt action which he has taken. I share with him the misgivings he has expressed, and I certainly hope that his subcommittee will go into the question quite fully. There are some points that I cannot understand. I cannot conceive of the action having been taken.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. In reply I should like to say that the committee will be most interested in determining whether any American money—as much as a single nickel of American money—shall go to the support of such a project in Cuba.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How can use of American money be avoided when 40 percent of the U.N. Special Fund is made up of American money?

Mr. CHURCH. That is precisely the question we shall ask. We shall also want to know what the American delegation at the U.N. has done to avoid this decision, and what proposed action the administration intends to take to deal with it.

CUBAN POLICY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] is confined to the hospital with a severe attack of influenza. He has asked me to request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record today a speech which he would have delivered had he been able to be present.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SIMPSON

Developments in Cuba and last week's massive attempt by the administration to overwhelm and discredit critics of the administration's Cuban policy compel me to raise questions and make observations that I hope will help shed some light on the confused situation regarding communism in Cuba.

In the first place, let me point out that the semantics of offensive and defensive missiles, and exactly how many Soviet troops are in Cuba, are largely irrelevant to the more important basic issue of whether any Communist presence is to be allowed in the Western Hemisphere.

For nearly 150 years American foreign policy has rested on a bedrock of strength; a bedrock that, until the present administration came into power, had been a clear directive to all foreign powers to keep out of the Western Hemisphere. That bedrock is the Monroe Doctrine which is just as important to our foreign posture now as it was in 1823, or in 1940, or in the Guatemalan incident of 1954. The State Department admitted as late as October 29, 1962, that the

principle of the Monroe Doctrine remains valid even though the "old imperialism of Western Europe has been replaced by the new and far stronger political and ideological imperialism of international communism." Despite this support for the doctrine and its long history of effectiveness, the administration has attempted to supplant it with something called the Kennedy doctrine which has come to typify uncertainty, indecision and vacillation.

Our failure to revitalize and employ the Monroe Doctrine in Cuba precipitated the tragedy which has uprooted hundreds of thousands of Cubans and placed communism on our very doorstep. This has led to the development of an insidious philosophy which many minds of this continent regard as the Khrushchev doctrine: That any left or Communist movement that manages to murder or bludgeon its way into power in the Western Hemisphere will be sustained in power by the force of Soviet arms. This is the credo of Castro as he spews his venom toward the other nations of the Americas. This is the fear in the hearts of Latin leaders who see the protectionist image of the United States fading away and feel they must look elsewhere for protection and support.

BRIEFING

Last week's unprecedented television briefing by the Secretary of Defense was an excellent attempt to prove a negative proposition. It purported to establish the attitudes of Mr. McNamara's knowledge of Cuban affairs. When viewed in the context of the Department's previous admissions of news manipulation, it is questionable how much credibility can be placed on the performance. The briefing might have given us an insight into the amount of information we do have concerning weapons in Cuba, but it only hinted at some of the intelligence gaps which remain.

Even Secretary McNamara and Mr. McCone of the CIA could not find concurrence in their statements of almost the same day on the effectiveness of aerial surveillance. While Mr. McNamara stated: "I am satisfied that there are no offensive weapons systems in Cuba, and I am satisfied of this beyond any reasonable doubt." Mr. McCone was admitting that: "Absolute assurance on these matters, however, could only come from continuing penetrating on-site inspections." I agree with Mr. McCone although it points up a substantial difference of opinion from two high administration officials on whose judgment rests much of the decisionmaking for our national security.

Aerial surveillance, as clearly implied by Mr. McCone, is effective only to the extent that objects are visible to a photographic eye. Obviously, missiles stored underground or in cleverly disguised shelters could not be identified or their nature interpreted solely through aerial photography. It can be stated with certainty that offensive weapons unloaded at night, stored in caves, and not set up in outside launching areas, would remain undetected. The extent of the military threat they pose would be commensurate with the speed with which they could be readied for firing.

SOURCES

Underground sources of unimpeachable honesty and integrity—the same sources which alerted the West to Russian troops in Cuba in mid-1962—now warn of such missiles stored in caves and tunnels at several points in Cuba. These reports, like those of last year, are made available to intelligence officials, but for unexplained reasons, they are regularly discounted. The sources have warned of missile concealment in the gigantic cavern of Santo Tomas, very near the San Cristobal missile base in Pinar del Rio Province.

The Remedios missile base site is conspicuously close to the cave of La Puntilla

1968

In the tract valuation report for one of the exchanges, a subtraction error of \$1 in computing timber stumpage rates caused a \$1.198 undervaluation of selected land.

Tract valuation reports and related documents on the four land exchanges that we reviewed contained undocumented, incomplete, and erroneous data on a number of factors affecting the appraised value of the exchange lands and timber thereon.

There is no excuse for such a discrepancy in the valuation of our valuable timber reserves; and while the Comptroller General does not specifically charge fraud, the kindest thing that can be done to the officials responsible is to charge them with gross incompetence or negligence of duty. In any event, someone should be fired.

I compliment the Comptroller General upon his report of December 28, 1962, and suggest that the Agriculture Committees of both the House and the Senate take notice of these transactions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the December 28 letter of the Comptroller General be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, December 28, 1962.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Herewith is our report on the review of certain land exchanges in the Pacific Northwest region (region 6), Portland, Oreg., of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

The act of March 20, 1922, as amended (16 U.S.C. 485), the legal authority for the exchanges, requires that the value of Federal land or timber given in an exchange may not exceed the value of the private land received by the Government.

The report deals primarily with two land exchanges in which Federal lands and timber conveyed to proponents (private parties) were sold by the proponents shortly after the exchanges for amounts that totaled about \$207,000 more than the appraised values, as established by the Forest Service, of the lands and timber received by the Government. Furthermore, the amounts received by the proponents from the sales of the selected lands (Federal tracts given in the exchanges) totaled about \$222,000 more than the values at which the Forest Service appraised these same lands. A major factor contributing to the differences between sale and appraised values of the selected lands was a significant underestimate by the Forest Service of the volume and value of merchandise timber on the selected lands.

To provide more assurance that appraisals of lands and timber in proposed exchanges will reasonably express the values of the resources involved so as to meet criteria of legislation on exchanges of equal values, we are recommending to the Chief, Forest Service, that agency procedures be reexamined with a view toward obtaining improved appraisals of selected and offered lands. Our report contains specific suggestions to help achieve such improvement.

A summary of our findings is presented in the forepart of the report. The views of Forest Service officials on these matters are considered in the report.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION OF ACTIONS BY U.N.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am extremely disturbed by the current impact and future implications of two stories concerning the United Nations which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post this morning. The one deals with the decision of the U.N. Special Fund to contribute financial assistance to a Cuban agricultural project on a 6-month test basis. The other describes rising protests against a Soviet-prepared publication of last year, issued by the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, on the subject of supposed racial and political equality in the U.S.S.R.

My most immediate concern, of course, is with the Special Fund action which, on its face, seems to give aid and comfort to a Cuban regime condemned by all countries of the Western Hemisphere. It is very difficult for me to perceive any justification for that action, and I believe the Senate is entitled to a full accounting. I also find it very difficult to understand how UNESCO can permit itself to be used by any one nation as an outlet for that country's political propaganda about its pretended domestic virtues.

In order to get all the facts straight on these two developments, I am taking immediate action to convene, as chairman, the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We shall be meeting as early as possible—probably on Monday morning—to receive a full explanation from high-level officials of the Department of State in executive session.

I know that many of my colleagues in this body are also upset about these circumstances involving the United Nations. I want to give them this early assurance that both matters will be fully looked into by the appropriate committee of the Senate. Thereafter, we shall make available to the public as much information as we possibly can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles published in the Washington Post to which I referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.N. TO GIVE FARM AID TO CUBA—6-MONTH TEST PLAN WILL HELP CROP DIVERSIFICATION
(By Dan Kurzman)

The United Nations decided yesterday to grant agricultural aid to Cuba in a move that the administration fears may add fuel to the attacks by some Congressmen on its Cuban policies.

The governing council of the 18-nation United Nations special fund will contribute on a 6-month test basis to a Cuban crop diversification program after having stalled on the decision since the project received initial approval in May 1961. The political dynamite lies in the fact that the United States furnishes about 40 percent of the fund.

Washington expressed regrets over the decision, though Paul G. Hoffman, American

managing director of the fund, said that no American money would be used on the project.

He has argued that this project would not injure the United States nor help Fidel Castro. Although Hoffman's role is that of an international civil servant, he has intimated that if the special fund ever approved a project that he thought would injure the United States he would resign from his job.

Administration officials may think similarly, but they are concerned that some Congressman might not. Perhaps indicative of things to come, Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, called the U.N. action a "jarring note to the already pronounced discord over Cuba. There should be firm resolve on the part of the United States to make no contribution to any United Nations fund which is used to thwart the foreign policies of the United States."

The fund's action is based on a policy that has been staunchly supported by the United States since the fund was born 4 years ago. Dispensing of aid money under this policy is determined strictly by the technical feasibility of proposed projects, never by political considerations.

As a result, the United States has been hamstrung in putting forth effective objections to the Cuban project. It has maintained that the aid cannot be efficiently applied in view of the emigration of qualified Cuban farm technicians, the slaughter of livestock, the plundering of other physical resources, and the general disorganization of Cuban agriculture resulting from the replacement of Cubans with Soviet technicians.

Such arguments, however, have made little impression on most members of the fund council, which consists of nine developed and nine underdeveloped nations.

But the council did agree to approve the project on a 6-month test basis, which would involve the expenditure of only about \$100,000 in U.N. funds. If at the end of that period the project proves feasible it will be extended for about 5 years with the U.N. share of the cost totaling about \$1.2 million. American officials would not state whether the United States would approve the program if the 6-month test proves successful.

The aid is contingent on the expenditure by Cuba itself of about \$2 million over the 5 years.

U.S. officials point out that although Washington contributes some 40 percent of the money in the special fund, it is actually paying only 17 percent of the total funds, including that part spent by the recipient countries themselves, devoted to U.N.-supported projects. U.N. contributions to 289 projects in about 70 underdeveloped nations amounts to \$257 million. Recipients are investing \$332 million.

U.S. EXPERTS BARRED

Hoffman said that the United States will be able to assure that no dollars will be used on the Cuban project by simply banning the use of American equipment and experts from participating in the program. Expenses will be met with the currencies of countries contributing to the scheme.

In any event, Hoffman pointed out, 5 to 10 years will be required before Cuba stands to benefit from the project. He added that if political considerations determined whether a nation was deserving of aid, few countries would receive assistance. Despite the objections of some nations, he stated, South Korea, the Republic of China, and South Vietnam are obtaining aid under the fund.

The United States did not ask for a vote on the question of aid to Cuba because it was evident that such a vote would have favored Cuba.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2191

in La Cantera farm, in Las Villas Province. It seems an odd coincidence that many of the acknowledged missile sites that figured in the October crisis were near caves of sufficient size to store missiles and other equipment. The Santo Tomas Cavern has over 8 miles of high ceilinged tunnel area, and the entire island is honeycombed with over 900 separate caverns.

Reliable Cuban underground sources have also pointed to the construction of at least three, and possibly five, submarine bases. The sources are sufficiently convinced of their facts to pinpoint two of the bases, one of which is only 80 miles northwest of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. I noticed in Sunday's paper that my colleague, Senator Aiken, has also warned of these bases.

There is only one manner of ascertaining whether missile or submarine bases remain in Cuba. That method is, as the President admitted in last week's news conference, on-site inspection which was a key issue of our blockade last October.

Another report, discounted by the administration, comes from the reputable military specialist, Rear Adm. Edward J. O'Donnell, who said that "Cuba is stronger now than it was before the missile crisis."

THREAT

Great emphasis has been placed on the question of Cuba as a military threat to the hemisphere. I would like to broaden the definition of a military threat to correlate it in some manner with guerrilla warfare and covert military action. Secretary McNamara says there is no evidence of Castro's attempt to export his Marxist revolution, but perhaps no great effort is being expended to seek such patent evidence.

Early in January President Ricardo Perez Godoy's military junta in Peru announced that it had smashed a plot masterminded by Moscow and Hanoi. Informed Government sources said, last week, that Castro has begun shipping arms to his Communist admirer, Cheddi Jagan, of British Guiana. The same Government sources admitted that this was the first confirmed case of what the United States has long suspected—that Castro intends to use his heavily fortified island as a transmission point for arms and propaganda.

Early this month Guatemala President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes stated that Russian submarines are transplanting men and arms in Latin America. The Guatemalan President said this clandestine operation has been underway since 1958. I strongly urge Mr. McNamara to study these and other incidents, and perhaps he will find the evidence of which he now seems bereft.

Aside from direct subversion, Communist agents in Cuba have a convenient first floor observation post from which to keep tabs on the U.S. space program at Cape Canaveral. Underground reports say that unusually large quantities of unorthodox electronic transmission equipment has been unloaded in Cuba. It is said to be of a type uncommon in normal communications use.

On this same subject, between the towns of Wejaj and Rincon in the eastern portion of Havana Province, the Soviets have constructed a powerful radio transmitter which allows them to maintain a liaison with Moscow and Peking.

Another factor in the "threat" controversy that is ignored by the administration is Castro's effect on the Alliance for Progress. We have pumped \$2 billion in Latin America under the program, but the crux of the alliance—the investment of American companies in Central and South America—has failed to meet even half of the earlier predictions. Less than \$150 million of a hoped for \$300 million of American investment capital has gone into the Alliance countries. The uncertainty of governmental stability, the

political question mark symbolized by Castro, and the dictator's previous seizures of American industries are said to be the biggest factors in the reluctance of investors to take risks in Latin America.

QUESTIONS

In a letter I dispatched this morning to Secretary of Defense McNamara, I propounded a number of questions which have not been answered by the administration. They are:

1. If the air surveillance is so effective, why were the missiles of the October crisis not detected when they reached the ports of Cuba and when they were transported to their respective sites?

2. If the United States did not detect the arrival of the missiles, how do we know that the 42 missiles, reportedly withdrawn, were the total amount of medium and intermediate range rockets shipped to Cuba? Can we rely on Khrushchev's word?

3. If the U.S. Government is unable to assure that medium and intermediate range missiles are not camouflaged or hidden in caves or underground installations in Cuba, why did the President lift the blockade without obtaining the on-site inspection which he had considered essential in his speech of October 22? How can on-site inspection at this crucial time be considered a dead issue?

4. How does the U.S. Government account for the admitted presence in Cuba of at least 17,000 Russian soldiers and military experts if during the October crisis the official estimates never exceeded 12,000? Did the air surveillance fail to determine the real number of troops or has there been a considerable military buildup in Cuba since the October crisis?

5. Have we conceded Russia a charter of impunity to stockpile in Cuba tons of arms which could make the strategic island an impregnable fortress from which to subvert and conquer Latin America?

6. Are we going to tolerate the Soviet military intervention in Cuba as long as we do not have an aerial photograph of a so-called offensive missile pointed at us? Is this the new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, and the 1962 joint resolution on Cuba?

7. Are we going to continue with the same policy which led to the missile crisis last October and which has not stopped Russia nor has stemmed Castro communist subversion throughout the hemisphere? Is it enough to say we are concerned as we contemplate the progressive undermining of democracy in Latin America and the enslavement and destruction of Cuba?

8. Why have we chosen to play down the threat of the exportation of Castro's revolution while at the same time ordering the establishment of a new group of anti-guerrilla military experts that will be based in the Panama Canal Zone to help Latin American countries cope with any Communist fomented uprisings? Is there in reality a great threat of the spread of Castro's Marxist line to other countries?

9. Why has the President failed to grasp the temper of American public opinion which he recognized in the October crisis and which is now strongly opposed to our ineffective Cuban policy?

10. If the abandonment of our Jupiter missile bases in Turkey and elsewhere was contemplated long before the Cuban crisis as the administration has said, and if this abandonment is not in anyway contingent on Khrushchev's withdrawal of some missiles from Cuba, why were our oversea bases so lavishly praised and verbally defended by the Defense Department as late as October 29, 1962? When Khrushchev eased international tensions prior to November 7, was it with the understanding that we would give up our oversea Jupiter bases?

11. Did the Soviet ship *Atkarsk* dock at the port of Cienfuegos last December 5? Was a highly secret cargo, quarantined from regular stevedores, unloaded by security police under command of a Soviet colonel, and was that cargo moved under cover of darkness in trucks driven by Soviet soldiers to caves on the island?

12. Why has the U.S. Government failed to recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, and why is there talk of disbanding the heroic brigade 2506 which fought so gallantly at the Bay of Pigs and which is the rallying point, the symbol of freedom to be regained, for Cuban refugees in the United States?

13. Despite the absence of on-site inspection, does there now exist a pledge, commitment, or understanding between the United States and Russia, or the United States and Cuba, which is a de facto promise not to invade Cuba?

14. What is the reason for the intelligence gap which apparently existed between early September and mid-October, before Senator Keating's statement regarding missiles in Cuba and before the Government's statement in support of the Senator's observations? Were no aerial photographs taken during that period, or was there evidence of the missile buildup in September and early October which was withheld from the public?

15. If we do not stop the onslaught of communism 90 miles off our own shores, how can we expect to maintain world leadership and even survive as a free nation?

16. If we accept the precedent of a Sovietized Cuba, how can we assure the other Latin American Republics that if they fall under Communist domination they will not be abandoned by the United States?

SUMMATION

I noticed in the President's health message that a "bold new approach" is needed in solving the Nation's health needs and that we can procrastinate no more for there is a medical crisis in our midst. Indeed, much of the New Frontier lexicon is wrapped in the crisis superlative—but not so the Cuban issue.

I maintain that it is time for a "bold new approach" to the Communist menace in Cuba—that it is time to halt our procrastination and take the steps necessary to eject Castro and communism from our neighboring island to the south.

It is unconscionable to me that we could allow the Soviet Union to colonize Cuba, 90 miles from the United States; that we could allow them to do this in direct contravention of the Monroe Doctrine; and that we could perpetuate this absurdity as we argue the semantics of defensive or offensive weapons. Our conduct—our so-called Cuban policy—has been preposterous. From a semblance of firmness and cognizance last October, we have regressed to the point of adopting co-existence with and containment of Castro rather than freeing the Cuban people.

The administration has attempted to delude the American public with talk of an imminent settlement of the Cuban crisis. This is manipulation of news and truth in the worst fashion, because the Soviets are in Cuba to stay.

There are at least 17,000 Russian soldiers in Cuba to make sure no uprising topples Castro. In the meantime Khrushchev is building factories and establishing trade ties to bind Cuba's economy with that of the Soviet bloc. They are building permanent barracks to house military units. They are constructing and managing schools, importing Russian teachers, and completely subverting the minds of Cuban children.

Youngsters in their formative years are being taught the glories of a Communist society, of Marx and Lenin, and of a Socialist state. As they enter adulthood, it will be with a firm background of Communist dog-

February 14

mas, which will have molded their character and their allegiances irrevocably to communism.

We must understand that the Soviets consider themselves to be in permanent possession of Cuba. They are communizing the economy, the education, and the very nature of life itself in Cuba. Khrushchev is building a Communist state from the basement up. He thinks he is there for the long haul.

Communism in Cuba is the greatest threat affecting the security of the Western Hemisphere and the world. We have been lulled into a false sense of security by an administration which has proven itself unable to cope with the crisis—an administration which alludes to nonexistent claims that the Cuban crisis will be over by March.

It will not be settled by March, or by July, or this year, or next, unless we learn the lesson of history that no nation has ever thrown off communism from within. Castro and communism will not fall until and unless they are pushed. And the United States must supply that push.

FORTHCOMING VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PRESIDENT ROMULO BETANCOURT, OF VENEZUELA

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, next week Washington will welcome as an official visitor one of the most distinguished statesmen of the free world—President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela.

President Betancourt was elected to a 5-year term in December 1958 in one of the few really free and honest elections which Venezuela has had. He came to power in a country which had been looted by the corrupt and brutal dictatorship of Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez.

President Betancourt launched a program of social reform and economic development which anticipated the Alliance for Progress by 2 years. His government has tripled expenditures on education while elementary school enrollments have doubled. Low-cost, self-help housing programs have been undertaken in both urban and rural areas. Health services have been improved and expanded and pushed into the countryside. Land reform has made real progress. All of this has been done within the context of orthodox fiscal policies and inflation has been avoided.

It has been done, also, despite the determined, relentless efforts of the Communists and their extreme left-wing allies to topple the Betancourt government by violence and subversion. This Communist campaign of terror takes the form of indiscriminate bombings and shootings in Caracas and of guerrilla activities in some rural areas. The Venezuelan Communists receive nightly encouragement from Radio Havana.

We all saw photographs in the newspapers in the last few days of the Sears, Roebuck warehouse burning.

Castro had made Betancourt his No. 1 target in Latin America, and with good reason. In the success of Betancourt's moderate, enlightened program of reform, the Communists rightly see the greatest threat to their own evil designs on this hemisphere.

So, Mr. President, as a Senator and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign

Relations, I want to add my word of welcome to President Betancourt. I am delighted that he is able to visit our country at this time, and I am sure that the talks he will have with President Kennedy and other officials will be fruitful.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY, ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

MR. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Turn Victory Into Defeat," by James Reston, which appeared recently in the New York Times, western edition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO TURN VICTORY INTO DEFEAT (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—The criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is now getting a little out of hand.

No doubt mistakes of tactics and even of taste have been made recently over the handling of Cuba, Canada, Britain, and France, but in the broadest sense, the President is in trouble now, not because his major foreign policies have failed, but because they are succeeding.

France and Canada are not refusing to accept U.S. nuclear weapons because they feel that Kennedy has weakened the West, but precisely because they think the West is relatively so strong that they can now follow a more independent policy and risk division within the alliance.

The unity that existed behind the President when he risked war to get the Soviet offensive missiles out of Cuba has vanished, not because he failed to get the missiles and bombers out, but precisely because he got them out and it is now safe to turn around and argue about the secondary issue of the Soviet troops.

Britain did not refuse to accept De Gaulle's terms for entrance into the Common Market because of any weakness in Washington, but precisely because it preferred to go along with the United States and the Atlantic community rather than with De Gaulle and an inward-looking Europe.

The paradox of the present situation is that everything in the cold war remains about the same as it was at the beginning of the year, yet everything seems different.

STAND NOW NEW

De Gaulle was refusing to cooperate with Washington and London on the defense and organization of Europe long before his famous press conference.

Much the same can be said about Canada. Prime Minister Diefenbaker was refusing to accept the U.S. nuclear warheads long before the State Department stumbled clumsily into an internal Canadian squabble; the only new thing is that he has now made an election issue out of Washington's awkward efforts to clarify the facts.

The question now is whether the Kennedy administration could have done anything to avoid the split with De Gaulle, the fight with Canada, and the present situation in Cuba. Much can be said on both sides of all three questions, and the President is certainly not blameless.

He first stumbled into Cuba and then misjudged Moscow's offensive policy there. It may be that he should now be considering a blockade of that island to get the Soviet troops out; that is a matter of opinion. But the critics are going beyond or behind all this to imply what they have not proved, namely, that the President made a deal with

Khrushchev to scrap the missile bases in Turkey and Italy; and beyond this, that the Soviets now have offensive missiles hidden in Cuba.

PROOF OR WITHDRAWAL

These last are charges of stupidity, bad faith or worse, and should either be proved or withdrawn. There is plenty of material on the Cuban issue for hard, fair criticism, and Kennedy's handling of the offensive buildup in Cuba justifies plenty of skepticism, but implications of secret deals and concealed weapons confuse and weaken the country unless they are supported with evidence.

The psychology of the opposition to President Kennedy here is clear enough. First, it is the duty of the opposition to oppose. Also, Kennedy clobbered the Republicans in the last Presidential campaign with charges that they had debased the Nation's prestige overseas. Thereupon, when he achieved power, he found, not the missile gap he had moaned so much about, but enough missile power to scare the Russians.

In this situation, the Republicans are naturally eager to pounce on him when he roughs up our Canadian neighbors or misjudges De Gaulle's intentions, and all this is fair enough.

But the thing has to be kept in perspective. For the conflict with a nation's enemies is more important than the quarrels with its allies, and on balance, the conflict with the Communists is not going too badly.

Meanwhile, fear in the Western Alliance has abated, and without fear a whole new set of problems has arisen, requiring new policies and new criticism.

"We have to learn to live with these problems in Cuba and elsewhere," the President has said. And this of course, is precisely the difficulty. For the American people don't want to learn to live with their problems or with the Russians, especially in Cuba. They want them to go away, all of them, and immediately, if not sooner.

THE ART OF POLITICS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MCGEE, OF WYOMING

MR. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the February issue of the NEA Journal contains an article entitled "The Art of Politics," written by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. As a former member of the teaching profession, the Senator from Wyoming directs his remarks to teachers, and reviews for them the nature and importance of politics. I believe other Senators and citizens generally will find his observations about politics of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REVIEW FOR THE TEACHER ON THE ART OF POLITICS

(By GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator from Wyoming)

During my years as a college professor, I frequently would ask my students for their definition of a politician. Their answers followed the general stereotype—a hypocritical creature with one hand in somebody else's pocket, a deep freeze in the basement, and a vicuna coat in the closet. In brief, a politician was sort of a confidence man in the public realm. He was the type you would deal with of necessity but would never invite home for dinner. And politics was the craft of outsmarting or outmaneu-

practicing attorneys in the United States—Bernard Segal, of Philadelphia, Pa.—who has served for many years as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the American Bar Association—yes, a man who, when he went before the Supreme Court as Attorney General, to argue a case would not be arguing his first case before a court, but instead a trial and appellate lawyer of many years, a real veteran instead of a novice.

I would hope that a Republican president's first nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court would be an outstanding statesman from Mississippi—to bring to the highest tribunal an understanding of the racial problem in the South that has too long been missing from the Supreme Court—but a Mississippian who is not an extremist but instead is a former judge and who is deeply respected by every Member of the U.S. Senate, liberal and conservative alike—and respected by all elements of the press—the junior Senator from Mississippi, JOHN STENNIS, the kind of man that Abraham Lincoln, the emancipator of the Negroes, would have the greatest confidence in.

I would hope that a Republican President's second nominee for the Supreme Court would be either Circuit Court Judge William H. Hastie or Circuit Court Judge Thurgood Marshall—to give the court a balance of understanding on the other side of the racial problem—preferably Judge Hastie because of his longer service on the circuit court.

Such is the kind of team that I think Abraham Lincoln would put on the field today in place of the existing team. It is a team that I feel the American public would have full confidence in.

THE 53D ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for the past week we have been celebrating the 53d anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America.

Over the years this worthy movement has been responsible for the guidance and leadership of more than 31,500,000 boys between the ages of 8 and 18. At the time when many boys are easily confused as to what is right and what is wrong, the Boy Scouts have stood for the traditional values of American society as expressed in the Scout law: trustworthiness, loyalty, helpfulness, friendliness, courteousness, kindness, obedience, cheerfulness, thrift, bravery, cleanliness, and reverence.

The Boy Scout program is one which appeals to the imagination of youth. It helps to teach them the skills necessary for maturity, both in developing a knowledge of outdoor life and in cultivating a sense of self-reliance and individual responsibility. With its interesting and unique projects, scouting offers boys the opportunity to learn and the incentive to achieve. In so doing, it has become a significant factor in the prevention and reduction of juvenile delinquency.

Boys need to belong to organizations in which they can participate in co-operation and in competition with others of their own age. The value derived from scouting experiences ranging from community newspaper drives to international jamborees is immeasurable in the character and personality development of our youthful citizens.

Neither must we forget the hours of guidance and direction given to the scouting program by the millions of

adult leaders and counselors since its inception in 1910. Without community interest and parental assistance, the Boy Scouts could not carry out their many worthwhile activities.

Today I am indeed proud to salute the Boy Scouts for their 53 years of service to the youth of America.

FILMS DEMOLISH A PANIC BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an editorial entitled "Films Demolish a Panic Buildup" that appeared in the February 8 edition of the San Francisco Chronicle. The editorial reflects my views regarding the controversy on Cuba. It makes two things very clear:

First. Any information received by a Member of Congress affecting the security of the United States ought to be turned over to Defense Secretary McNamara and to Mr. McCone, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, because this information should be evaluated. We cannot run the foreign policy or the military policy of this country on the basis of rumors or gossip. Mr. McNamara and Mr. McCone are both patriotic, able, and intelligent men. I believe their judgment should be trusted with reference to security matters. Incidentally, they are both Republicans.

Second. We should not tell our enemies everything we know; we should leave to the discretion of Mr. McNamara and Mr. McCone the question of what ought to be revealed. For instance, the remarkable television program referred to in the editorial disclosed our capability in the field of aerial reconnaissance to a degree which I feel was not in the national interest.

These two points stand out clearly in the editorial. I am glad that the San Francisco Chronicle has stated the case as eloquently as it has, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FILMS DEMOLISH A PANIC BUILDUP

The briefing on Cuba presented to the American public by the Defense Department on television Wednesday gave remarkable and convincing photographic evidence of the dismantling of Soviet missile bases and bomber units after the October showdown with Russia.

It is to be hoped that this proof has successfully aborted and left stillborn one of the most irresponsible campaigns of fright and panic ever waged against the minds and emotions of the American people for partisan political and venal press purposes.

No reasonable viewer could fail to accept the photographic proof that the offensive missiles and bomber aircraft which had been observed going into Cuba on Soviet ships last fall had been dismantled and removed and carried home beyond any reasonable doubt. This is the President's and Defense Secretary McNamara's conclusion, supported by the judgment of Director John A. McCone of the CIA. On the basis of the evidence, now shared with the thinking public, they are attempting to proceed with their responsibilities for the security of the Nation and the Western Hemisphere.

To see the photographic reconnaissance record and to hear the careful interpretation of its meaning was to realize that the Soviet buildup in Cuba early last fall had been swift, logistically brilliant, and terribly menacing, but that the disassembly and removal of the long- and medium-range missiles and bomber aircraft had been equally swift, complete, and fully verified.

The TV presentation of the story told by Air Force and Navy air reconnaissance over Cuba was the best rejoinder which could be made in the name of sanity and objectivity to the fright campaign lately organized in Washington and across the country to confuse and unsettle American public opinion.

We have watched this campaign develop in the San Francisco valley of the Hearstland desert with a growing sense of contempt. Headlines intended to stagger the public have presented a preposterous series of reports from—of all fertile places—Mexico City about an "alarming buildup in Castroland" and "caves full of missiles."

These cave tales are calculated to leave the public forever in a panic of doubt about the disappearance of the missiles. This sort of newspaper scare campaign is just as empty of journalistic integrity as the Cuban caves are empty of offensive missiles.

It seems appallingly irresponsible of Senators KEATING, THURMOND, and DIRKSEN to join this coterie of inventive journalists who consult reliable but unnameable sources to conjure up the illusion of a buildup in Cuba threatening an invasion of the United States. It is a mythology which is preposterous and dangerous, and we should like to believe that President Kennedy, his advisers, and the military recognize that it does not represent the true tenor of American thinking.

COLORADO RIVER DISPUTE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the fourth and final article in a series of reports in the San Diego (Calif.) Union on the dispute between the United States and Mexico over salt in the Colorado River.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PART 4

WASHINGTON.—There are those who believe the water of the Colorado River can get salty enough to pickle the fish and, under terms of the 1944 treaty, that will just be Mexico's tough luck.

The official position of the United States is that Mexico is guaranteed 1.5 million acre-feet of water a year from all sources in the river but that there is absolutely no guarantee of water quality. There have been widespread expressions of sympathy over Mexico's plight. But all governmental offers of help have been carefully worded so there is no acknowledgement of responsibility for good water.

What the United States is doing is sticking to its understanding of the treaty signed by the two countries in 1944 and ratified by the United States and Mexican Senates in 1945. Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, of Arizona, is one of the few men left in Congress who participated in the U.S. hearings.

"There was no guarantee of quality of water to Mexico," HAYDEN remembers. "It was only upon this understanding that the Senate ratified the treaty. Without this understanding the treaty would not have been ratified."

HAYDEN expresses a popular southwestern view when he says, "The present situation is, in large part, the result of improper irrigation practices and lack of proper drainage in Mexico, dating back for more than 20 years."

The Senator is convinced that farmers in the Mexicali Valley made the present problem inevitable by trying to put too many acres under irrigation and then applying too little water to the land to keep salts from accumulating in the soil.

HAYDEN notes that Mexico blames her current problem solely on the operation of Arizona's Wellton Mohawk project which admittedly is returning water with a high salt content to the river.

But the Senator argues: "Return flow from other projects located upstream have an opportunity to mix with the regular flow of the river and in that way be diluted. Therefore, although Mexico is currently objecting to only one project, the principle involved affects all existing projects . . . and would extend to projects not yet constructed."

Senator HAYDEN said the water being delivered to Mexico in the winter of 1961-62 "was equal to or better than the supply available for many irrigated areas that are successfully irrigated in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas."

HAYDEN was asked about the risks if Mexico takes the dispute, as has been threatened, to the International Court of Justice at the Hague.

"Mexico certainly could not be confident of a favorable decision," the Senator said. This is certainly in accord with the present public position of the United States. But recently there has been some evidence that the rockfast stand of 1944 may be softening. California Attorney General Stanley Mosk has said flatly that "equity is on the side of Mexico."

Water lawyers have expressed the opinion that if the United States-Mexican dispute goes into the International Court, or even a U.S. court, the judges may apply the test of "reasonableness" to the treaty and conclude that a guarantee to supply water means usable water.

The attorneys admit the question is an open one. The right of an upstream irrigator to dump unlimited quantities of salt into a stream as return flow has never been tested in the courts. (The courts have ruled, however, against smelters and oil wells in similar situations.)

And even at the State Department, where our spokesmen contend that Mexico must put up with whatever increases in salinity that are caused by the normal development of the river, there seems to be fear of what might happen if Mexico pressed her specific charges against the Wellton-Mohawk project. Mexico, of course, contends that the very salty water being pumped into the river from Wellton-Mohawk's subterranean pool is not really return flow as contemplated by the treaty.

Mexico has talked of an \$80-million project to improve irrigation and drainage in the Mexicali Valley. There would seem to be little point in this expenditure, however, if the water reaching Mexico in the Colorado River continues to be unusable. It has been suggested that part of Wellton-Mohawk's discharge be dumped, via a special canal, directly into the Gulf of Mexico. Presumably this water could not be charged to Mexico, but would be charged to the U.S. share of the river. The lower basin States, already scrapping over every acre-foot, are not likely to take this kindly.

Senator HAYDEN has suggested that if Mexico goes to court it loses the hope that the United States will act voluntarily to correct the situation on this side of the border. Conversely, the United States also would lose the chance to reap any good will from whatever remedial measures are taken.

Then, too, the lower basin States of the Colorado will soon have to decide whether they want to make their stand on the basis of the Wellton-Mohawk operation which

puts about four times the amount of salt into the river as the average project. As a matter of pure self-interest, would they want to see a precedent established to the effect that an upstream water user is completely unrestricted as to the amount of salt he can pour into the river?

It is being argued, here and in the Southwest, that the basin States and the Bureau of Reclamation would be far ahead in the long run to move in and do the drainage work needed to clean up the return flow from Wellton-Mohawk. This would keep the 1944 treaty out of the courts and avoid the possibility of an outside authority trying to impose new regulations or even new apportionment on the waters of the Colorado.

A bonus benefit could be the avoidance of a nasty international situation along the border that could only please the enemies of the United States.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the toll of deaths by accidents continue inexorably year by year despite the best efforts of all our safety experts and our authorities. Because I am always interested in doing whatever I can to spotlight safety and to help everyone to realize that safety, in this society, is a very personal project, I was interested in an article entitled "Safety Is a Personal Thing," written by a Marylander, Mildred Hall, and carried in the December 1962 issue of the National Surveyor, published here in Washington by a man who is known to many of us, Larston D. Farrar.

I am proud to notice, too, that the article quotes Paul Burke, director of Maryland traffic safety in our department of motor vehicles, and that it reveals what strides are being taken, and what steps must be taken, to insure the safety of an intrepid and hard-working group—our land surveyors.

I might say, Mr. President, that during this month of February, the Nation again will pay tribute to surveyors who became our most illustrious Presidents. George Washington, as is well known, was a surveyor for 8 years after winning his right to chart land from William and Mary. It is not so well known that Abraham Lincoln, too, while a postmaster, served also as a part-time surveyor in the Sangamon country from which he sprang into national prominence. I could list others in our Nation's storied past, including Mason and Dixon, who surveyed the famous Mason-Dixon line.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Hall's article from the National Surveyor be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAFETY IS A PERSONAL THING (By Mildred Hall)

(The surveyor is the last of the true pioneers—he must map the new and uncharted, the heights and the depths. He faces danger daily, with a special courage; but like the pioneers of old, he is too often scornful of the risks, careless of his safety.)

In the gathering dusk of a winter afternoon, two young surveyors stood at the edge of the Washington-Baltimore Parkway. Their dark-toned clothing made them almost invisible in the fading light. Cars capriciously past them at breakneck speed. No warning signs slowed the passing motor-

ists, or signaled that surveyors were working.

In one passing car, a man commented grimly: "I wouldn't work in a spot like that for all the money in the world. It's a wonder they're alive." The man knew whereof he spoke—he was Paul Burke, director of Maryland traffic safety in the department of motor vehicles.

Not too far from this scene, on a fast-paced urban highway, another young surveyor worked several feet off the shoulder of the road. Fifty feet behind him, at the edge of the paving, a work truck flashed yellow lights, warning passing motorists.

A car leaped down the road, the driver the worse for a few drinks, police reported later. Apparently startled by the blinking lights, the driver swerved, lost control of the car and slammed up the shoulder of the road—killing the 25-year-old surveyor instantly.

Could the tragedy have been avoided? The chances are, it could have been. There was some measure of precaution in this case—but not enough. Not nearly enough, according to the standards now set by Federal, State, and county rules for protecting their own surveying and engineering employees on public highways.

The warning signs that should have been placed a good 500 feet (more or less, depending on the road speeds allowed) on either side of the surveyor were not there. Perhaps their bright-orange warning squares would have given the driver pause, eased his foot on the accelerator, and prepared him for the flashing truck lights at the edge of the road.

Getting back to our first pair of surveyors—they were lucky. But will they shoulder the tripod and go home safe to their families if they continue playing Russian roulette with their lives? Even if no safety devices had been provided for them, they could have worn bright colored shirts and put reflector tape on the tripod—and if necessary, made themselves a couple of road flags.

"If I had my way," says Paul Burke, "They would all wear bright-colored and identifying clothing, just like jockeys at the track. I'd like to see a whole succession of warning signs, at intervals, like the Burma Shave signs, warning motorists in larger and larger letters: 'Danger, Surveyors ahead. Surveyors at work.' And if the work jeopardized lives—on a road curve, or a center lane—I'd have the section of the road blocked off."

The Traffic Safety Commission of Maryland has no jurisdiction over private surveyors, other than standard traffic regulations. Burke believes that the State or county or municipality should provide identifying clothing and safety equipment for all surveyors—not just for those employed by the civic units. "For the comparatively small amount it would cost, it would be worthwhile if just one single surveyor's life were saved."

Surveyor associations and groups are urged to do more along these lines. They could put their case before State assemblies when they convene, to get some legislation to provide safety for surveyors on roads and streets.

"If just one State were to pass laws setting up safety requirements for surveyors, the thing would spread. The surveyors and their associations should band together and act in unison to get protective legislation. It is long overdue." The Maryland safety commissioner also urges surveyors to use the practical, commercial advantages to safety in their argument. Surveyor injuries and deaths mean substantial loss of money, time, and valuable skills.

There are any number of sound safety programs for surveyors to use as models to protect themselves and their fellows in the field. There is also much that can be done to orient the public toward traffic safety rules to

was not quite bright. Another is the feeder at the public trough living on subsidies, and still another, the cruel taskmaster exacting hard labor from unfortunate peons at starvation wages. Then there is the farmer in his expensive car and the farmer who will enter the exclusive club of millionaires when his land is sold to the subdividers. And there are other images.

But why so many? Why not one composite image? What is it about the farmer which makes him the whipping boy of the jokesters, the hated land baron and the despised benefactor of governmental subsidy?

All this is the usual line of comment. But now a new factor has been added. The farmer is now movable. His farm is not a collection of fields and buildings but an economic factor which can be transferred, willy-nilly, out of the fertile flatlands and up into the foothills, without regard to soil, weather, transportation, water, or any of the things which contribute to the economic success of a farm. Or the farmer is a drain on the public pocketbook, and the workers which he attracts become public charges either in our jails, our hospitals, or on relief.

Rather than being the producer of new wealth which multiplies over and over, benefiting the economy with every turn, he is becoming an enemy of the people. Rather than being given recognition for paying a lion's share of the taxes, he is derided as a public charge and the breeding ground of social and economic ills at the expense of the remainder of the economy.

What sort of cancer is eating at the public consciousness that it can produce such images of agriculture? Let us hope that this is just a passing phase and that it will soon subside and go away.

Pat Patterson
In the Cuban Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 8, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

IN THE CUBAN CORNER

Perhaps, as Secretary McNamara says, there are no offensive weapons in Cuba, but we don't see how many Americans could be reassured by his elaborate but essentially confused television presentation. The undeniable fact remains that at least 17,000 Soviet troops are deployed in Cuba, plus mammoth quantities of modern arms.

Actually, the precise numbers of men and types of weapons are somewhat beside the point. The most un reassuring thing about the whole business is the revelation of how dismally unfinished it is. We had the Soviets on the run, and now it is all too plain that we failed to run them all the way out.

There was no apparent need for this failure. The Government was undoubtedly right to focus its attention on getting the known intermediate-range missiles out of Cuba, and the military-diplomatic operation to that end was excellent. The partial blockade was accompanied by plain warnings of tougher action if the U.S. terms were not met.

But for that very reason the United States was in a perfect position to carry the exercise to its logical conclusion. It should have told Khrushchev to remove every last

one of his soldiers and send in not so much as one more rifle, lest he risk the most serious consequences. Everything about the Soviet reactions in October argues that Khrushchev would have complied; indeed, how could he not have, smack up against the full array of U.S. military power?

Why wasn't it done? We suppose in part because of the same mental attitude which has so often bedeviled the United States in dealing with the Soviets, an attitude that in all fairness has been in evidence before as well as during this administration. It is a fear of pushing the enemy too far, of backing the bear into a corner from which it can escape only by attacking. The idea is always to give the Soviets a partial exit or some means of face saving.

As a general theory, this thinking has merit. It is obviously true that we can push the Soviets too far. If we had intervened in Hungary—their own property however illegally taken—they would have had almost no choice but to fight us and no one knows where it would have ended. Or in Berlin, we probably could have gotten away with knocking down the wall when it first went up, but if we had proceeded to take over East Berlin in the bargain, the Soviets couldn't let us do it without a fight. For the Soviets, those would be real corners.

But it is a total misunderstanding of the theory to apply it to Cuba, for Cuba is the exact reverse of those corners. Cuba is our frontyard, and the Soviets were rapidly pushing us into a corner. No matter who was President, the U.S. Government would have to react, and there would have been no reason to expect trouble from the Soviets if we had reacted all the way instead of just halfway. By not following through, we simply invited Khrushchev to go ahead with the present buildup.

Now the situation is immensely more difficult. We can still tell the Soviets to start packing, but we have lost almost all the powerful psychological leverage we enjoyed from Khrushchev's missile retreat in October. Now any U.S. move runs a greater risk of fighting Soviet troops.

Soon or late, one way or another, the business will have to be finished. When the time comes, let us at least have learned the lesson and for once do it right.

**Miss Meredith Wood of Penn Yan, N.Y.,
Is Honored by Being Named New York
State Junior Miss**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday a lovely, charming, and most talented young lady who lives in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, Miss Meredith Wood, of Penn Yan, N.Y., was chosen for the honor of being New York State Junior Miss. Miss Wood is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, Penn Yan. I know that all of us in the 35th Congressional District are pleased and honored by the selection of this gracious and lovely young lady, and I know that our thoughts and best wishes will go with her as she travels to Mobile, Ala., next month to compete in the 1963 National Junior Miss contest.

I will say to my colleagues here on this floor that New York, the great Empire State, now feels quite confident that with such a talented entrant in the national contest, New York's Junior Miss, Miss Wood, will soon be crowned as Miss America Junior Miss.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following press account from the Geneva Times, of February 11, of the events leading to Miss Wood's selection for this great honor:

MEREDITH WOOD—PENN YAN GIRL CAPTURES CROWN IN STATE JUNIOR MISS CONTEST

PENN. YAN.—Blonde, blue-eyed Meredith Wood has been crowned "New York State Junior Miss" in competition in Schenectady Saturday night, and will compete for \$6,000 in scholarships in the National Junior Miss Contest in Mobile, Ala., next month.

Meredith, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, was met in Dresden yesterday by a motorcade of Penn Yan Jaycee members, the sponsoring organization, and escorted to the Wagner Hotel for a reception and Coke party.

Wearing the gleaming crown she won in the State contest, Meredith stood in a reception line with her parents, Mayor John E. Buckley, and Jaycee President Donald Flynn and his wife, greeting hundreds of friends and well-wishers.

Fred Fellows, manager of the Geneva Coca Cola Bottling Co., provided Coke for the reception in behalf of his company. Coca Cola, with Bonnie Brooks fashions and Eastman Kodak, are cosponsors of the national contest.

At the State level, Meredith won an immense trophy, a \$750 scholarship, a 10-piece wardrobe, and 2 cameras. Just 1 week earlier she won a \$100 scholarship when she was acclaimed "Yates County Junior Miss" in competition with seven local nominees. Robert Pepper and Eugene Guild were co-chairmen of the local Jaycee contest.

Meredith competed with 20 New York State girls in the Schenectady contest, and was judged in sportswear (blouse and shorts), in a talent contest in which she played the flute, and in an evening gown, together with personal interviews with the judges. Pat Patterson, of Albany, master of ceremonies at the event, also cited Meredith for her talent at the presentation of the trophy. A victory party at the Hotel VanCurler followed the contest. Local Jaycees Ralph Heil and Eugene James attended the State contest.

Contestants were judged on alertness and scholastic achievement, personal interview with the judges, on creative and performing arts, on poise and appearance, and on youth fitness.

Meredith is an honor student at Penn Yan Academy and plans to attend Potsdam University next fall where she will major in music.

What's Wrong in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record the text of an editorial published in the New York Times of January 15, 1963, entitled, "What's Wrong in Vietnam?"

The editorial follows:

training. The Manpower Development and Training Act is the first direct attempt made by Congress to find a longer range solution to the unemployment problem. It is based on the premise that unemployed workers can and will find jobs when they are qualified to hold them. It applies specifically to the subject I am discussing today because it is designed to train individuals in rural areas for both farm jobs and nonfarm employment. There is not time for me to go into detail on any of these Government programs today. I am sure you will be discussing them in other sessions of your annual meeting. I know that NRECA is already working with Government representatives on these programs. But I do want to say that if these programs are to be successful, they must be based primarily on local leadership and action. Without local cooperation, guidance and action, they won't be worth a plug nickel. And this is where I am going to get into the specifics on the ways that I know you women of rural electrification can help most effectively.

Education: We must see that the schools in our local areas—grade schools, high schools, junior colleges where they exist, vocational schools—are offering a curriculum and a training designed to provide our young people with the skills most needed in their own community or elsewhere in their urban centers. Here is where women can back up their school boards and school organizations in demanding an enriched curriculum or a re-emphasized curriculum. Here is where we can bend every influence in persuading our young people not to drop out of high school, or to go to college, or to special vocational training in place of college. Here is where women can work individually and in groups on financial aid through loans or scholarships to help the young people in their rural area train for the jobs where they are so desperately needed.

Area redevelopment: The opportunities in these programs are almost endless. While your husbands are working in public or private organizations, on ways to attract new payroll into a rural area, whether it be a small industry or a process plant or a business agency, you can make a tremendous contribution in helping him sell your community as a good place to live. You know, those management executive boards who make the final decisions on locating a business or a plant or an industry look at a lot of important factors in making this decision. They look at the availability of power, and water, and labor, and land, and they take a good sharp look at the tax situation of this State, but they look at something else, too. They call their top personnel men in and they explain that they are considering a move to a certain area. Those men go home and tell their wives about this proposed move—and what do the wives ask? You know as well as I do. What kind of a town is it? What about the schools? And the Churches? What recreational and social and cultural facilities are there? Is it a pretty town? Will the people be warm and friendly? How about the health facilities? Well, have you taken a good look at your community lately? Would you want to move there? I have talked to many a business executive who said that a decision to choose one location over another many times rested in balance on a nice city park or a swimming pool and a good sewage system.

The rural electric wife: As you can see, I have just touched on a few of the possibilities for participation on your part in your new role in rural America. There are hundreds of other possibilities. And I am very sure that many of you are already engaged in one or more of the community improvement activities that help to improve your area. In this respect, about all I can hope to do is inspire in you a new urgency for getting on

with the job and some new reasons for so doing.

Up to now, I have been talking about women fulfilling their responsibilities to the community in many traditional and familiar ways. But I would like to close by speaking on the very special and unique contributions you have to make to rural America because you are the member-owners of the rural electric. If we are to create job opportunities by attracting new plants and industry into new areas, availability of electric power must keep up with demand. All available sources of power must be encouraged and fostered to grow with this demand. The rural electrification program must keep pace and must stay strong and productive so it can offer its special and unique service of power to rural areas development. To do this it must maintain public support and that can be gained only if there is public understanding. In this respect I think one of our biggest problems is being taken for granted. We have a whole generation of new consumers who just flip the switch. You and I flip that switch, too, but we have the knowledge and the remembrance of what a comparatively recent blessing it is and how hard we fought for this simple privilege. How long has it been since you have seized the opportunity to tell some newcomer or young wife in your area the simple but thrilling story of how electricity came to the farm? How long has it been since you read some of your husband's trade magazines or publications so that you could tell an interesting story using an easy-to-understand example of what keeps a consumer rate low? This is your very special role as a member of the NRECA family. Nobody else can play the part as well as you.

You in this room today represent a very important segment of those electrical utility groups who have developed rural America to its present strength. For this the Nation owes you much—and asks still more. Asks still more in its need for the special skills, knowledge, understanding, and faith you have to give if we are to keep American agriculture strong and growing. God grant you the strength, the wisdom, and the inspiration to make your participation complete and effective.

Income Tax Withholdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, judging from the caliber of a so-called public service announcement being distributed by the Internal Revenue Service, the average taxpayer is assumed to be pretty stupid and unaware of the heavy tax burden he is carrying to pay for his share of the tremendous cost of our Federal spending programs.

This announcement is similar to the animated cartoon used in a popular toothpaste TV commercial with the familiar line, "Look, Ma, no cavities."

In our federally produced commercial, the narrator is shown in the film interviewing Joe Doaks who tells how the boys down at the factory have been separated into two groups, A and B, for the past year. Group A has had "increased withholdings" all year. The scene then changes to Joe Doaks' home and shows him coming in the door hold-

ing up his form 1040A card exclaiming, "Look, Ma, no taxes." He then goes on to explain how much happier everyone in group A is because they do not have to pay any taxes and many receive refunds, whereas group B individuals frequently have to pay taxes.

The implication is clear that Joe Doaks and his fortunate friends in group A are paying no Federal income tax. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Joe and his friends in group A have paid more each week through the painless method of additional withholdings, permitting the Government to claim their substantial share of his earnings a little sooner than they might otherwise.

This clearly is another example of misleading advertising, and since the Federal Trade Commission is charged with the responsibility of protecting the American public from fraudulent and misleading advertising, I am referring this matter to that agency for investigation.

To me, this is just another insidious device of the welfare state planners to lull the people into further apathy as to the true cost of government. I hope such false advertising can be kept off the television screens of this Nation.

Public Image of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in "The Ventura County Rancher With Al Tiffany" column in the January 1963 issue of the Broadcaster, monthly publication of the Ventura County Farm Bureau:

THE VENTURA COUNTY RANCHER WITH AL TIFFANY

Have you ever had the feeling that something was not just right but you couldn't put your finger on it? Well, perhaps you have had that feeling about the public image of agriculture.

Public officials, private citizens, and even organizations often refer to the fact that agriculture is our most basic and productive industry and that it contributes the most to our overall economy. It is even said, now and then, that this is an agricultural country and that each of us is a farmer at heart.

But underneath it all one is forced to wonder how much of this is lipservice and just how sincerely it is meant. Now and then a suspicion creeps in that there is an underlying element of criticism.

Traditionally the farmer has been held apart from the rest of the populace—perhaps partly due to his own actions. But it is a truism that the image of the American farmer may take many forms.

One image is the embattled farmer and his defense of his fledgling country during the American Revolution. One is the country bumpkin who was the butt of jokes which required the services of someone who

was not quite bright. Another is the feeder at the public trough living on subsidies, and still another, the cruel taskmaster exacting hard labor from unfortunate peons at starvation wages. Then there is the farmer in his expensive car and the farmer who will enter the exclusive club of millionaires when his land is sold to the subdividers. And there are other images.

But why so many? Why not one composite image? What is it about the farmer which makes him the whipping boy of the jokesters, the hated land baron and the despised benefactor of governmental subsidy?

All this is the usual line of comment. But now a new factor has been added. The farmer is now movable. His farm is not a collection of fields and buildings but an economic factor which can be transferred, willy-nilly, out of the fertile flatlands and up into the foothills, without regard to soil, weather, transportation water, or any of the things which contribute to the economic success of a farm. Or the farmer is a drain on the public pocketbook, and the workers which he attracts become public charges either in our jails, our hospitals, or on relief.

Rather than being the producer of new wealth which multiplies over and over, benefiting the economy with every turn, he is becoming an enemy of the people. Rather than being given recognition for paying a lion's share of the taxes, he is derided as a public charge and the breeding ground of social and economic ills at the expense of the remainder of the economy.

What sort of cancer is eating at the public consciousness that it can produce such images of agriculture? Let us hope that this is just a passing phase and that it will soon subside and go away.

Had Cuba
In the Cuban Corner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 8, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal:

IN THE CUBAN CORNER

Perhaps, as Secretary McNamara says, there are no offensive weapons in Cuba, but we don't see how many Americans could be reassured by his elaborate but essentially confused television presentation. The undeniable fact remains that at least 17,000 Soviet troops are deployed in Cuba, plus mammoth quantities of modern arms.

Actually, the precise numbers of men and types of weapons are somewhat beside the point. The most un reassuring thing about the whole business is the revelation of how dismally unfinished it is. We had the Soviets on the run, and now it is all too plain that we failed to run them all the way out.

There was no apparent need for this failure. The Government was undoubtedly right to focus its attention on getting the known intermediate-range missiles out of Cuba, and the military-diplomatic operation to that end was excellent. The partial blockade was accompanied by plain warnings of tougher action if the U.S. terms were not met.

But for that very reason the United States was in a perfect position to carry the exercise to its logical conclusion. It should have told Khrushchev to remove every last

one of his soldiers and send in not so much as one more rifle, lest he risk the most serious consequences. Everything about the Soviet reactions in October argues that Khrushchev would have complied; indeed, how could he not have, smack up against the full array of U.S. military power?

Why wasn't it done? We suppose in part because of the same mental attitude which has so often bedeviled the United States in dealing with the Soviets, an attitude that in all fairness has been in evidence before as well as during this administration. It is a fear of pushing the enemy too far, of backing the bear into a corner from which it can escape only by attacking. The idea is always to give the Soviets a partial exit or some means of face saving.

As a general theory, this thinking has merit. It is obviously true that we can push the Soviets too far. If we had intervened in Hungary—their own property however illegally taken—they would have had almost no choice but to fight us and no one knows where it would have ended. Or in Berlin, we probably could have gotten away with knocking down the wall when it first went up, but if we had proceeded to take over East Berlin in the bargain, the Soviets couldn't let us do it without a fight. For the Soviets, those would be real corners.

But it is a total misunderstanding of the theory to apply it to Cuba, for Cuba is the exact reverse of those corners. Cuba is our frontyard, and the Soviets were rapidly pushing us into a corner. No matter who was President, the U.S. Government would have to react, and there would have been no reason to expect trouble from the Soviets if we had reacted all the way instead of just halfway. By not following through, we simply invited Khrushchev to go ahead with the present buildup.

Now the situation is immensely more difficult. We can still tell the Soviets to start packing, but we have lost almost all the powerful psychological leverage we enjoyed from Khrushchev's missile retreat in October. Now any U.S. move runs a greater risk of fighting Soviet troops.

Soon or late, one way or another, the business will have to be finished. When the time comes, let us at least have learned the lesson and for once do it right.

Miss Meredith Wood of Penn Yan, N.Y., Is Honored by Being Named New York State Junior Miss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday a lovely, charming, and most talented young lady who lives in the congressional district I have the honor to represent, Miss Meredith Wood, of Penn Yan, N.Y., was chosen for the honor of being New York State Junior Miss. Miss Wood is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, Penn Yan. I know that all of us in the 35th Congressional District are pleased and honored by the selection of this gracious and lovely young lady, and I know that our thoughts and best wishes will go with her as she travels to Mobile, Ala., next month to compete in the 1963 National Junior Miss contest.

I will say to my colleagues here on this floor that New York, the great Empire State, now feels quite confident that with such a talented entrant in the national contest, New York's Junior Miss, Miss Wood, will soon be crowned as Miss America Junior Miss.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following press account from the Geneva Times, of February 11, of the events leading to Miss Wood's selection for this great honor:

MEREDITH WOOD—PENN YAN GIRL CAPTURES CROWN IN STATE JUNIOR MISS CONTEST

PENN YAN.—Blonde, blue-eyed Meredith Wood has been crowned "New York State Junior Miss" in competition in Schenectady Saturday night, and will compete for \$6,000 in scholarships in the National Junior Miss Contest in Mobile, Ala., next month.

Meredith, 17-year-old daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Leon Wood, of 114 Burns Terrace, was met in Dresden yesterday by a motorcade of Penn Yan Jaycee members, the sponsoring organization, and escorted to the Wagner Hotel for a reception and Coke party.

Wearing the gleaming crown she won in the State contest, Meredith stood in a reception line with her parents, Mayor John E. Buckley, and Jaycee President Donald Flynn and his wife, greeting hundreds of friends and well-wishers.

Fred Fellows, manager of the Geneva Coca Cola Bottling Co., provided Coke for the reception in behalf of his company, Coca Cola, with Bonnie Brooks fashions and Eastman Kodak, are cosponsors of the national contest.

At the State level, Meredith won an immense trophy, a \$750 scholarship, a 10-piece wardrobe, and 2 cameras. Just 1 week earlier she won a \$100 scholarship when she was acclaimed "Yates County Junior Miss" in competition with seven local nominees. Robert Pepper and Eugene Guild were co-chairmen of the local Jaycee contest.

Meredith competed with 20 New York State girls in the Schenectady contest, and was judged in sportswear (blouse and shorts), in a talent contest in which she played the flute, and in an evening gown, together with personal interviews with the judges. Pat Patterson, of Albany, master of ceremonies at the event, also cited Meredith for her talent at the presentation of the trophy. A victory party at the Hotel VanCurler followed the contest. Local Jaycees Ralph Heil and Eugene James attended the State contest.

Contestants were judged on alertness and scholastic achievement, personal interview with the judges, on creative and performing arts, on poise and appearance, and on youth fitness.

Meredith is an honor student at Penn Yan Academy and plans to attend Potsdam University next fall where she will major in music.

What's Wrong in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the text of an editorial published in the New York Times of January 15, 1963, entitled, "What's Wrong in Vietnam?"

The editorial follows:

1963

training. The Manpower Development and Training Act is the first direct attempt made by Congress to find a longer range solution to the unemployment problem. It is based on the premise that unemployed workers can and will find jobs when they are qualified to hold them. It applies specifically to the subject I am discussing today because it is designed to train individuals in rural areas for both farm jobs and nonfarm employment. There is not time for me to go into detail on any of these Government programs today. I am sure you will be discussing them in other sessions of your annual meeting. I know that NRECA is already working with Government representatives on these programs. But I do want to say that if these programs are to be successful, they must be based primarily on local leadership and action. Without local cooperation, guidance and action, they won't be worth a plug nickel. And this is where I am going to get into the specifics on the ways that I know you women of rural electrification can help most effectively.

Education: We must see that the schools in our local areas—grade schools, high schools, junior colleges where they exist, vocational schools—are offering a curriculum and a training designed to provide our young people with the skills most needed in their own community or elsewhere in their urban centers. Here is where women can back up their school boards and school organizations in demanding an enriched curriculum or a re-emphasized curriculum. Here is where we can bend every influence in persuading our young people not to drop out of high school, or to go to college, or to special vocational training in place of college. Here is where women can work individually and in groups on financial aid through loans or scholarships to help the young people in their rural area train for the jobs where they are so desperately needed.

Area redevelopment: The opportunities in these programs are almost endless. While your husbands are working in public or private organizations, on ways to attract new payroll into a rural area, whether it be a small industry or a process plant or a business agency, you can make a tremendous contribution in helping him sell your community as a good place to live. You know, those management executive boards who make the final decisions on locating a business or a plant or an industry look at a lot of important factors in making this decision. They look at the availability of power, and water, and labor, and land, and they take a good sharp look at the tax situation of this State, but they look at something else, too. They call their top personnel men in and they explain that they are considering a move to a certain area. Those men go home and tell their wives about this proposed move—and what do the wives ask? You know as well as I do. What kind of a town is it? What about the schools? And the Churches? What recreational and social and cultural facilities are there? Is it a pretty town? Will the people be warm and friendly? How about the health facilities? Well, have you taken a good look at your community lately? Would you want to move there? I have talked to many a business executive who said that a decision to choose one location over another many times rested in balance on a nice city park or a swimming pool and a good sewage system.

The rural electric wife: As you can see, I have just touched on a few of the possibilities for participation on your part in your new role in rural America. There are hundreds of other possibilities. And I am very sure that many of you are already engaged in one or more of the community improvement activities that help to improve your area. In this respect, about all I can hope to do is inspire in you a new urgency for getting on

with the job and some new reasons for so doing.

Up to now, I have been talking about women fulfilling their responsibilities to the community in many traditional and familiar ways. But I would like to close by speaking on the very special and unique contributions you have to make to rural America because you are the member-owners of the rural electric. If we are to create job opportunities by attracting new plants and industry into new areas, availability of electric power must keep up with demand. All available sources of power must be encouraged and fostered to grow with this demand. The rural electrification program must keep pace and must stay strong and productive so it can offer its special and unique service of power to rural areas development. To do this it must maintain public support and that can be gained only if there is public understanding. In this respect I think one of our biggest problems is being taken for granted. We have a whole generation of new consumers who just flip the switch. You and I flip that switch, too, but we have the knowledge and the remembrance of what a comparatively recent blessing it is and how hard we fought for this simple privilege. How long has it been since you have seized the opportunity to tell some newcomer or young wife in your area the simple but thrilling story of how electricity came to the farm? How long has it been since you read some of your husband's trade magazines or publications so that you could tell an interesting story using an easy-to-understand example of what keeps a consumer rate low? This is your very special role as a member of the NRECA family. Nobody else can play the part as well as you.

You in this room today represent a very important segment of those electrical utility groups who have developed rural America to its present strength. For this the Nation owes you much—and asks still more. Asks still more in its need for the special skills, knowledge, understanding, and faith you have to give if we are to keep American agriculture strong and growing. God grant you the strength, the wisdom, and the inspiration to make your participation complete and effective.

Income Tax Withholdings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, judging from the caliber of a so-called public service announcement being distributed by the Internal Revenue Service, the average taxpayer is assumed to be pretty stupid and unaware of the heavy tax burden he is carrying to pay for his share of the tremendous cost of our Federal spending programs.

This announcement is similar to the animated cartoon used in a popular toothpaste TV commercial with the familiar line, "Look, Ma, no cavities."

In our federally produced commercial, the narrator is shown in the film interviewing Joe Doaks who tells how the boys down at the factory have been separated into two groups, A and B, for the past year. Group A has had "increased withholdings" all year. The scene then changes to Joe Doaks' home and shows him coming in the door hold-

ing up his form 1040A card exclaiming, "Look, Ma, no taxes." He then goes on to explain how much happier everyone in group A is because they do not have to pay any taxes and many receive refunds, whereas group B individuals frequently have to pay taxes.

The implication is clear that Joe Doaks and his fortunate friends in group A are paying no Federal income tax. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Joe and his friends in group A have paid more each week through the painless method of additional withholdings, permitting the Government to claim their substantial share of his earnings a little sooner than they might otherwise.

This clearly is another example of misleading advertising, and since the Federal Trade Commission is charged with the responsibility of protecting the American public from fraudulent and misleading advertising, I am referring this matter to that agency for investigation.

To me, this is just another insidious device of the welfare state planners to lull the people into further apathy as to the true cost of government. I hope such false advertising can be kept off the television screens of this Nation.

Public Image of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in "The Ventura County Rancher With Al Tiffany" column in the January 1963 issue of the Broadcaster, monthly publication of the Ventura County Farm Bureau:

THE VENTURA COUNTY RANCHER WITH AL TIFFANY

Have you ever had the feeling that something was not just right but you couldn't put your finger on it? Well, perhaps you have had that feeling about the public image of agriculture.

Public officials, private citizens, and even organizations often refer to the fact that agriculture is our most basic and productive industry and that it contributes the most to our overall economy. It is even said, now and then, that this is an agricultural country and that each of us is a farmer at heart.

But underneath it all one is forced to wonder how much of this is lipservice and just how sincerely it is meant. Now and then a suspicion creeps in that there is an underlying element of criticism.

Traditionally the farmer has been held apart from the rest of the populace—perhaps partly due to his own actions. But it is a truism that the image of the American farmer may take many forms.

One image is the embattled farmer and his defense of his fledgling country during the American Revolution. One is the country bumpkin who was the butt of jokes which required the services of someone who

it may spark latent qualities of firmness and leadership.

A successful game warden by nature is an individualist. He enjoys being his own boss, working out his own problems and the competition of matching wits with offenders of the law. He is not just a woods cop, although he must be a crafty manhunter, with the sleuthing ability of a city detective as well as a master craftsman in the woods. He must know the laws he enforces from A to Izzard and be something of a trial lawyer.

In this present day of automobiles and radio, he is beginning to lose affinity with nature; with the woods, fields, and waters. He hikes less, rides more and does not put forth the physical effort of his predecessors; seldom carries a pack or sleeps in the brush.

Too few wardens ever reach their full potential in their own field or the broader field of conservation. They fail through lack of hard work and diligence to master all the many ramifications of the work so necessary for success. This is equally true with other specialists. When a warden allows the job to become routine, he is either slipping or lacks imagination. There is no place for routine in game law enforcement. In addition to knowing all the tricks of the trade in enforcement, the warden should be well grounded in the biological field of fish and game, and have a working knowledge of forestry and land management. All these specialties develop him into the overall field man that he should be. By virtue of these additional attributes he will be less a cop and more of a conservationist, less sadistic and better balanced in humility and humor.

Above all, he must have an intense fever for his work, be fanatically conscientious, indifferent to hours, physical discomforts, poor pay, and public abuse. Many are called, some are chosen, but too few really succeed. There is no better job in the entire field of conservation upon which to build decision and judgment for all specialties than some basic training in law enforcement.

The Post-Dispatch on Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the Congress, I introduced a bill designed to make more fair the procedures in use for citing individuals for contempt of Congress. I believe our rules are weak in this area for we allow, in the normal case, the same committee of the Congress to be victim, prosecutor, and first judge of the contempt. I question whether a similar procedure instituted in a court of law would meet the requirements of due process.

In an editorial on February 1, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch takes note of my proposal and adds its support to it. I am very pleased that they have done so for I believe this is one of the procedural reforms which can help bring the Congress into better shape to perform its assigned tasks. I especially commend the Post-Dispatch's emphasis on the help this proposal could provide to the Congress. Aside from the very important benefits to those who are charged with

contempt, a sounder procedure for the handling of congressional contempt citations will make this form of protection for the Congress far more meaningful. I would urge that the fullest consideration be given this proposal and I am placing the St. Louis-Dispatch editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help explain more fully the purpose and the scope of this bill.

The article follows:

MR. CURTIS' SOUND BILL

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS has offered a bill to revise contempt-of-Congress procedures which we think Congress might well accept. What the Webster Groves Republican offers is a simple change: to establish a kind of screening committee to consider requests for contempt citations from other committees and to refer them to the House or Senate for action if that seems advisable.

Mr. CURTIS points out that the two busy Chambers are hard pressed to consider thoroughly contempt charges offered by various committees. The temptation may be to accept the committee's word for instituting proceedings, but in such cases, the committee is acting as both the injured party and the prosecutor. What is needed is a separate committee to serve as a kind of grand jury, and to give contempt charges the kind of objective study they are unlikely to get from a committee that feels it has been treated contemptuously.

The Curtis proposal would improve the fairness of the contempt proceeding; it might also help Congress. In its last session, the Supreme Court set aside contempt convictions of nine men because the indictments did not state the subject under inquiry when the men were questioned. To some extent this may have been the fault of officers who drew up the indictments, but it is also true that committees on general probing and exposure expeditions sometimes are not certain as to what they are investigating. In such cases, contempt actions can be a waste of time. A committee as suggested by Mr. CURTIS, which might screen out baseless actions, would strengthen Congress power to use the contempt proceeding to protect itself.

Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a radio broadcast this week I asked some questions that are of grave concern to the residents of the First Wisconsin District and, indeed, to all Americans. Under unanimous consent, I raise those questions here because of the interest of our colleagues in the Congress in this subject and with the hope that someone occupying a position of trust in the White House, or someone with an unclogged pipeline to the White House, will come through with the answers.

Text of the broadcast follows:

Something new has been added to the normally heavy mail load coming into my Washington office. People back home are not only stating their views, they are asking questions. The subject is Cuba. And they're asking questions they should never

have had to ask, for information to which they are entitled. They're confused, and small wonder. So are the Members of the Congress.

There are two general areas of confusion and uncertainty. One is of the extent of the continuing Soviet Communist threat in Cuba, centered around what has—or what has not—taken place in Cuba since the President, last October 22, announced the quarantine of Cuba. It has to do with a documented clarification of the military and missile situation in Cuba as it is today. The other has to do with the "deal" to ransom the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

In the next few minutes I want to direct my remarks to the latter category, the payment of blackmail to the Cuban Communist dictator, Castro. Citizens in the First Wisconsin District have written me for information. A survey of their letters indicates that they want to know whether or not our Government is involved, along with private firms and individuals, in this ransom deal, and if so, to what extent?

If the Government is involved, it should not be classified information. Why isn't the public told outright all the facts?

If the Government is not involved, what right do private citizens have to deal with foreign governments?

What is or will be the effect of this action on foreign policy and foreign relations, not alone with Cuba but with other nations?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency underwrite the ransom payment? If it did, by how much?

Has any portion of the payment gone to the Soviet Union?

What concessions, if any, did the Internal Revenue Service make to the contributors?

What concessions, if any, did the Justice Department make in connection with the ransom contributions?

What concessions, if any, did other Federal agencies make in connection with the ransom contributions? Such as the Agriculture Department; the State Department; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Is it true that the drug firms involved not only obtained tax concessions but actually sold their products at wholesale?

If the drug firms made a profit, how much?

Did the first payment of ransom by the United States in its history damage U.S. prestige in other countries?

Did not the United States admit to Communist Fidel Castro's continued authority in Cuba by paying a ransom to him just after he had helped the Kremlin try to get an atomic "drop" on us?

Did not payment of this U.S. ransom fasten the fetters of slavery tighter on the helpless Cuban people?

It's reprehensible that citizens of this free and open society are not given—without asking for it—all the information to which they are entitled.

It is my conviction that an appropriate committee on the House call in American officials involved—Attorney General Robert Kennedy, for one—as well as the U.S. firms and other key figures so that the public can be properly informed, for, after all, what we are doing or failing to do in our relationship with Cuba affects each and every one of us personally.

One of the great dangers confronting any people is secrecy on the part of governments where nonclassified matters are concerned. Secrecy creates suspicions, which do much to destroy the faith of the people in even good governments.

This particular action—the Cuban ransom deal—is shrouded in a heavy mist of secrecy. Knowledge is withheld from even those who are elected to represent the people. The people have a right to know the facts, and I call on the proper officials of the executive branch of the Government to provide them.

1963

WHAT'S WRONG IN VIETNAM?

American officials have hastened to contradict pessimistic conclusions from last week's South Vietnamese battle with Vietcong guerrillas. Saigon's troops were reported to have shown a lack of offensive spirit and five American helicopters were shot down. General Harkins, the American commander in South Vietnam, defends the valor and courage of the Vietnamese soldiers. Admiral Felt, U.S. commander for the Pacific, says, after a visit to Saigon, that last week's battle was no harbinger of Vietcong success, as some observers have implied, but that, on the contrary, the South Vietnamese are definitely winning their war against the Communists.

It is worthwhile being reminded that losses in one battle, or even a dozen battles, do not portend loss of the war in South Vietnam. The fact remains, however, that serious defects of political policy and leadership in South Vietnam do seriously hamper the spirit and effectiveness of the South Vietnamese military forces. A defensive reaction to adverse reports about last week's battle should not obscure a deficiency that is well documented and is often cited by Americans on the spot in Vietnam.

Plainly, the South Vietnamese armed forces are not so good and spirited as they might be because a suspicious, dictatorial Government at Saigon must preoccupy itself with preserving itself in power, not just from Communists but from many patriotic Vietnamese who also oppose the Communists.

Loyalty to President Diem is the criterion for preferment among Vietnamese officers rather than ability. It is a situation that is not entirely eradicable in the circumstances that now exist in South Vietnam, but it is one that both the Americans and President Diem should try to alleviate. Last week's battle emphasizes the need for stronger efforts in this direction.

beginning of providing decent wages for hard-working people who struggled to hold a place in society.

But this hallmark was not the beginning of his dedication towards the rights of free men, for he served his country well during its struggle in the Spanish-American War and World War I.

He is a man of many abilities. He enjoys a brilliant career as a lawyer—a champion in the defense of the poor and unfortunate. He is also noted as a journalist, author, orator, and businessman.

His career in the House of Representatives did not begin until 1949, but since that time, his many abilities have been of great value to his constituency as well as the Nation.

As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee he has proven his worth in solving the many problems encompassing this important field. He is a leading authority on African affairs and his knowledge and interest of Latin America have been valuable to our relationships with these world areas.

His success in life cannot be measured by any one outstanding achievement for there have been many accountable to him. He richly deserves the gratitude of our citizenry and I am pleased to have this opportunity to extend my best wishes to him on his golden anniversary of unselfish devotion to his country and neighbors.

May this remarkable record of service continue for many more years for there will always be a need for his wisdom and understanding of the many problems the Nation is confronted with each day.

**[From the Rice Lake (Wis.) Chronotype]
 A DISTINGUISHED RESIDENT**

For the first time in history, probably, a Rice Lake man's achievements were made the subject of a national television show when the deeds of Ernest Swift were dramatized Sunday night over the CBS television network.

The show depicted an heroic incident in the life of the local man which occurred a long time ago—1928 to be exact. But it must be stressed that Ernest Swift, who has chosen Rice Lake as his home in retirement, can rest on many laurels other than the incident dramatized Sunday. But, as is the case with most talented and dedicated men, Swift though retired is still not resting.

More than anyone in the United States, probably, Ernest Swift is the most dedicated, emphatic, farsighted, and articulate exponent of conservation of the great and God-given natural resources of this Nation.

He first attracted major attention, true, for his courageous role as a young conservation warden in Sawyer County in apprehending bigtime Chicago hoodlums for their fish and game violations, at considerable physical hazard.

But from there Ernest Swift went forward to become a forthright and unswerving devotee of sound conservation practices in Wisconsin as the State conservation department director. Upon retiring from that position, he foresook the easy life in favor of the responsibility of becoming the executive secretary of the National Wildlife Federation, with headquarters in Washington, D.C. Here again his vigor and dedication won him recognition and acclaim.

Finally, he stepped down from that lofty post and moved to Rice Lake in retirement. But he continues to journey to Madison and to Washington periodically as a consultant and adviser with a wealth of experience and sound counsel. Only recently he was presented a top award by a national forestry association for his contributions to sound forestry management and conservation. His picture appeared in papers throughout the land.

He still serves as conservation adviser for the National Wildlife magazine, writes authoritative articles on conservation for national magazines and, when the occasion demands, can get on his feet and make a persuasive address like he did the other day at Spooner on the question of opening the Chippewa flowage to ice fishing.

Altogether, quite a man, Mr. Swift. America is awakening to the critical need for preservation of its fast shrinking areas of untrammelled, uncontaminated wilderness and it is men like him, cast in the mold of courageous champions, who have been in the forefront of this worthy fight. We're happy to have him with us as a distinguished resident.

**THE MAN WITH THE BADGE
 (By Ernest Swift)**

Pinning a badge on a man does something to him; his mental outlook has to adjust to the responsibility and authority vested in him. The authority to restrict the liberty of fellow citizens should not be taken lightly nor should it be abused. The adjustment will determine a man's ability, self-restraint, judgment, and courage. A badge can expose sadistic qualities formerly unknown or concealed.

A successful lawman must be endowed with certain basic characteristics. Among the most important are judgment and decision; a split-second decisiveness to follow through, and in emergencies, to be able to shoot the works without thought of personal safety. Whereas one rookie can be ruined by a situation of sudden violence, in another

Representative Barratt O'Hara of Illinois

SPEECH

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
 OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 4, 1963

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for many, 50 years is a lifetime, but amongst us today, there is a gentleman from Illinois for whom 50 years is just a milestone in a career dedicated to serving his fellow man. A career, I might add, which I hope will continue for another 50 years. I refer to my very good friend and neighbor from Chicago, the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, the able Representative from Illinois' Second District.

Fifty years ago, at the young age of 30, BARRATT was chosen as a candidate for the seat of Lieutenant Governor of Illinois—the youngest man ever to be considered for this important post. Needless to say, the people of Illinois, at the time, recognized his ability, his aggressiveness, and his dedicated spirit toward his country, by electing him to fill this office.

In this capacity he aroused great interest in the slave wages being paid in his State and this interest occasioned the passage of minimum wage laws in several of the States. It marked the

**Ernest Swift: Conservationist
 Extraordinary**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the acknowledged leaders in the conservation field today is my good friend Ernest Swift, who now is semiretired and lives in my home district in Wisconsin. His distinguished career covers many years of service as a conservation warden in Wisconsin, as director of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, and as executive secretary of the National Wildlife Federation.

A dramatic incident from Mr. Swift's days as a conservation warden was the subject of a recent national television show, which detailed how he apprehended bigtime Chicago hoodlums for their fish and game violations at considerable risk to himself. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Rice Lake Chronotype, of Rice Lake, Wis., which pays tribute to this great conservationist. I would also like to include an article written by Mr. Swift entitled "The Man With the Badge":

what we now see—a non-Department of State.

There are good bits, like Gov. Averell Harriman's Far Eastern sector, and there are very bad bits. But the point is that it is all in bits. It is not a unified Department, guided by a common viewpoint imposed by its leader, and working toward a common aim, clearly defined from above. It is a congeries of competing viewpoints contrasting personalities, and conflicting ambitions.

Among the New Frontiersmen, there are two popular excuses for this irrational gap in the middle of an administration otherwise notable for its competence and coherence. It is said that nothing can be done because "the President is his own Secretary of State." Or it is said that "the real Secretary of State" is the President's brilliant and knowledgeable personal chief of staff for foreign affairs, McGeorge Bundy.

But that is nonsense. As the foreign policy record shows, the President, and Bundy too, for that matter, need a Department to work with. As the case of the Defense Department shows, that relationship is far from impossible. And as long as the State Department is really a non-Department, other damaging affairs will follow the Canadian affair, the Skybolt affair, and all the earlier ones, quite possibly with end results calamitous to the President himself.

Evidence Mounts for Action To Isolate Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 11, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Communist Cuba has just received a partial shipment of Japanese-made fishing trawlers. The order was placed earlier in Japan by the Cuban Government, and additional trawlers are due to arrive in March. The Japanese merchant fleet continued during the month of January its usual practice of transporting goods to Cuba.

The fishing trawler is one of Fidel Castro's most useful weapons in his campaign to subvert Latin America. He has learned the Soviet trick of using the term "fishing trawler" to describe any vessel whose purpose it is to engage in espionage, the transport of subversive agents, and contraband arms.

The Japanese merchant fleet is also free at any time to continue its usual practice of putting into any U.S. port for cargo, and Japan is only one example of how our allies all over the world trade with us and the Communists in Cuba as well. The most glaring examples of this trade are seen when the ships of nations allied with the United States continue to put into Cuba, their hulls bulging with Communist goods.

The United States does not allow its own vessels to call at Cuban ports. Why should it open its harbors and lucrative commerce to the ships of Cuban traders.

I again urge as I have been doing almost each day the House has been in session that the United States stiffen its recent timid shipping order and

crack down on those nations continuing to engage in shipping to Cuba. The only way to accomplish this purpose is to close U.S. ports to the nations who will not cooperate with us.

The Olympic Games of 1968

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD M. RYAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 days have been very hectic in the city of Detroit. Charges and countercharges have been flying about as heavily as debris in a tornado. The words "unfit" and "doublecross" have been thrown about as part of the everyday conversation.

This all stems from the fact that the executive board of the U.S. Olympic Committee, in a sudden and drastic move, stripped the city of Detroit of the status given to it last October 15 when Detroit was officially authorized to be the only U.S. city to seek the Olympic games for 1968.

Last Tuesday the Governor of the State of California contacted the executive board of the Olympic Committee, indicating that Detroit was not yet ready for the job of handling the 1968 Olympics, and that Los Angeles would be in a position to do so. In withdrawing its approval of Detroit, the U.S. Olympic Committee opened a back door to have Los Angeles again come into the picture as a bidder for this international sports festival.

In presenting their arguments, the Los Angeles group indicated that their bid should be heard by the full committee which, in essence, would compare to a congressional subcommittee hearing testimony on legislation; and, before action could be taken on the recommendation of a subcommittee, hearings again would have to be held by the full committee in order to approve such legislation.

We in Detroit are angered over the tactics taken by the city of Los Angeles and the State of California. These two jurisdictions are not showing good sportsmanship. It is with great disappointment to me to learn that Detroit's designation as the only American entry in the Olympic program will have to be fought all over again. It is my belief that in the long run, Detroit will be awarded the 1968 Olympic games, but only after a hard and uphill struggle.

Detroit is a dynamic city—it is a sports-minded city. Its citizens have the ambition and the initiative to finance and put on this great spectacle in the world of sports. It is my belief that Detroit will stand up to all of the requirements necessary to put on a good show.

Detroit is centrally located within the confines of the United States. Ten domestic airlines provide direct service between the city of Detroit and the

major cities in every section of the country. These lines use Detroit-Wayne Major Metropolitan Airport and Willow Run Airport, both of which are within a half-hour ride of the civic center in downtown Detroit. The Detroit City Airport, 10 minutes from downtown Detroit can be used by special charter flights. Six major railways provide passenger service to Detroit's three terminals, all located in the downtown area. Three interstate and six major U.S. highways connect directly to Detroit's freeway system. It is, therefore, apparent that no matter where you are in the United States, it is only a matter of hours—short hours at that—and you are in the city of Detroit.

The citizens of Detroit have been working over a number of years to lead a Detroit movement for the Olympic games. I am sure that if given the opportunity to proceed with the development of its facilities to host the 1968 games, they will be able to fulfill the requirements of putting on a splendid exhibition.

I believe that the committee, when they meet March 18, will fully consider the merits of the proposal made by the city of Detroit, and will recommend that the original decision remain in effect.

In the past, Detroit has been the unsuccessful bidder before the International Olympic group six times, but the campaign to bring these games to Detroit has continued throughout the ensuing years. I believe that in the name of justice and equity, the international committee reaffirm its position that was won in fair competition with other States.

The final selection for the site for the 1968 Olympic games will be made by the International Olympic Committee at a meeting at Nairobi, Kenya, on October 13, 1963. It is my hope that the argument between two cities of the great United States will not be a detriment to us with the final result being the awarding of the games to a European city, which is very possible. We, in Detroit, intend to press our demands for recognition as the only city recommended for the 1968 Olympic games, and shall take every possible means to have the U.S. Olympic Committee approve Detroit as the site. However, we will do it with good sportsmanship and fair play. Los Angeles, in its action of a few days ago, indicated that they are still a long way from making friends and influencing people, with their unwarranted and unsportsmanlike conduct.

Baptist Message Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 29, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Baptist Message of Alexandria, La., on February

er, grazing lands, timber, minerals, and all the rest.

These are national, not local, resources. With the help of leaders such as you this Nation can meet the challenge set before its President just last Thursday.

We can provide for greater demands for the products of our water, our soil, our forests, and minerals, and in so doing we can eliminate poverty and want and we can increase employment.

We can help our neighbors and ourselves to raise our standards of living.

This, to my way of thinking, is the only sure way which we can solve our domestic and international economic and social problems, so important to a stable and peaceful free world.

Thank you.

Alsup's Fables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to feel that the management of news, openly admitted by some sources within the administration in the past, is not confined to straight reporting of events as they happen. A curious pattern has emerged in the ranks of those who label themselves political columnists or analysts. By no means does this pattern appear to apply to the great majority of writers—rather to a few.

In a column appearing in the Washington Post on Monday, February 4, Joseph Alsup, touches on the errors in diplomacy that have multiplied of late within the conduct of our foreign policy. Specifically, he calls attention to the Canadian-United States nuclear arms argument, the Skybolt episode, and the resultant stand taken by De Gaulle. Then he searches unhesitatingly for the culprit—and finds it in the State Department organization and administration. Why is it that way? Why, because of the Eisenhower administration.

According to Mr. Alsup, "President Kennedy has not got a State Department." In what may well be the opening shot to remove Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Alsup concludes that Mr. Rusk has no executive leadership, however wise in policy he may be. Further, he has no organization—because during the 8 years preceding Mr. Kennedy's inauguration, the Department was "simultaneously debased and inflated to the point of dropsy." Mind you, this was Mr. Dulles' fault, not that of his successor Christian Herter—for after all, Mr. Herter is now employed by the Kennedy administration is he not?

According to the writer, the people within the administration themselves have two excuses for the failures of the administration in foreign policy and the disorganization of the State Department. First, that the President is his own Secretary of State; second, that the real Secretary of State is McGeorge Bundy, the President's adviser for foreign affairs. Cries Mr. Alsup: "Non-

sense." Nothing wrong with policy, just with organization. Nothing wrong with the President's judgment—just those under him.

How reminiscent of columns by certain members of the press following the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Not the President—the CIA; the Eisenhower administration before him. Or consider the Saturday Evening Post article, coauthored by an Alsup, on the "doves and hawks" at the time of the Cuban quarantine decision. A scapegoat in the form of the Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, was set up just in case. Now the new target is much less personal, and, for that reason, presumably more palatable—it is that organization known as the State Department.

Mind you, I am not taking sides on whether any or all of these men or organizations bear part of the blame in any given situation. I simply fail to see how the President himself escapes mention when, for example, he personally took the responsibility for the Bay of Pigs. In the present situation, the Skybolt controversy, Mr. Alsup tells us, raged throughout October and November. Could not a single word from the Chief Executive have ended this public display? Or was he unaware that it was going on, as he was unaware of complaints by Federal employees of pressure to buy tickets to a political fundraising event of recent date? If it was possible, as Mr. Alsup says it was, for the State Department to anticipate the reaction of Mr. de Gaulle to the "questionable"—Mr. Alsup's words—multilateral Polaris arrangement at Nassau, why was it not equally possible for Mr. Kennedy to do so? What information did he lack to make such a judgment?

As for the Canadian episode, regardless of the correctness of the American position—originated under President Eisenhower—the handling of the situation was decidedly amateurish. Mr. Alsup states that "according to authoritative report" Mr. Kennedy is angry at the Canadian bloopers, and that heads will roll. If it is the organization, not the man, what heads are on the block? And who or what is this "authoritative report"? The latter, of course, is an extension of the age-old practice whereby a statement is made by someone in authority as background or briefing to the press with the stipulation that his name not be mentioned.

It is unfortunate, however, for the Nation as a whole, and for the press in particular, that the administration has chosen to bestow favors on particular members of the press. Insidious politicking by even the well-meaning among the palace guard of columnists simply adds another weapon to the news management arsenal. Fortunately, Mr. Alsup's latest article was painted in such fairytale black and whites that the American people can be excused if they number it among Alsup's fables.

The column follows:

WHAT HAS GONE WRONG?

(By Joseph Alsup)

According to authoritative report, few bloopers have angered President Kennedy quite so much as the State Department's

impulsive intervention in the Canadian Parliament's debate on national defense.

It is not clear who was responsible for yielding to the human, all-too-human temptation to show up Prime Minister Diefenbaker, who clearly deserves it. What is clear—what should have been clear from the first—is that yielding to this temptation only made a bad business worse.

Since the President is angry, it is to be presumed that someone will pay for the blooper. But if the President is wise, he will ask himself whether the fault does not lie deeper than the individual bad judgment of this or that official or policymaker.

The Canadian affair, after all, comes hard on the heels of the Skybolt affair, which was very much more damaging. And the Skybolt affair could have been as easily avoided by a little foresight as the Canadian affair could have been avoided by staying silent.

No supernal powers of prophecy were needed to foresee that the U.S. Government would eventually have to make the offer to share remaining Skybolt development costs with Britain—the offer with which the President in fact opened his Nassau meeting with Prime Minister Macmillan. If that offer had been made at the end of October, there would have been no Skybolt row, for the British would then have had no possible grounds for complaint against the United States.

Instead the Skybolt row raged through November and December, doing this country untold damage with all its allies. And when the cost-sharing offer was at last made at Nassau, it was refused by Prime Minister Macmillan; for the British had decided in the interval that they too did not want Skybolt.

The result, in itself somewhat questionable, was the substitute offer of Polaris missiles for the British Navy. This was wrapped up in the scheme for a multilateral deterrent, which General de Gaulle was blandly invited to join.

Once again, it was predictable that De Gaulle would feel he was being treated lightly. He was duly enraged. And it is at least an even bet that this Nassau-born fury was what drove De Gaulle to cross the important line between obstructing the British entry into the Common Market, which he was already doing, and positively vetoing the British entry, which he thereupon did.

Other cases might be cited. But it is not needful to go further, in order to prove that down deep in the system something is very wrong somewhere. What is wrong is not difficult to spot, either. President Kennedy has not got a State Department.

In Secretary of State Dean Rusk the President has a wise policymaker, but a man with no knack and no taste for executive leadership. Yet executive leadership was desperately needed; for the organization Rusk inherited, which had been the most powerful and creative agency of Government under Harry S. Truman, was already in sorry condition when Rusk took office.

In the era of John Foster Dulles, the effective State Department was contained by the four walls of Dulles' private office; and in this period, for various reasons, the rest of the Department was simultaneously debased and inflated to the point of dropsy. In his short, widely underestimated term in office, Christian A. Herter fought a successful holding action, but that was the best he could manage.

Thus Rusk's task would never have been easy, even for a man with the executive talents of a Dean G. Acheson, a Robert A. Lovett, or a Robert McNamara. Before choosing Rusk, the President made the task harder still, in ways that are too obvious to need naming. A Secretary unable or unwilling to assert executive leadership was then installed in a Department debased, dropsical, and divided. This combination has produced

February 14

The project, which will get underway in 3 or 4 months, will provide technicians in animal husbandry, grasslands management, and plant pathology.

**PUBLICATION POLICY REVIEW FORCED—
UNESCO BOOKLET PROTESTS RISE**
(By A. I. Goldberg)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., February 13.—Protests over a year-old UNESCO publication containing profuse claims about guarantees for racial and political equality in the Soviet Union have forced UNESCO to review its publication policy.

UNESCO is the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, based in Paris. It has the status of a specialized agency of the United Nations. Some conservative organizations in the United States have criticized it for its views on social and cultural problems.

The United States contributes nearly one-third of UNESCO's \$39 million annual budget. The Soviet Union pays about 15 percent.

The publication, written by a Soviet educator and a Soviet lawyer, asserted in one passage that "in 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which voluntarily joined the Soviet Union."

A U.S. source said the United States protested vigorously last April, shortly after the book was issued, and was told that a lack of firm policy directives rendered UNESCO powerless to deal with such cases.

A review committee, set up as a result of U.S. and other protests, is expected to report in April, the source said. The U.S. National Committee for UNESCO has submitted recommendations and criteria for stricter standards.

The new complaint—one of many, an informant said—came from the Assembly of Captive European Nations in New York. It is a group comprising political exiles from Eastern European countries, including the Baltic republics (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia), whose incorporation into the Soviet Union early in World War II has never been recognized by the United States, Britain and many other nations.

A letter from the assembly's president, George M. Dimitrov, appealed to Vittorino Veronesi, UNESCO Director General, to halt distribution of the 106-page booklet. He called it "cheap Soviet propaganda, falling short of UNESCO objectivity," and termed it "harmful to the rights of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania."

The booklet was the third of a series of six planned by UNESCO in 1951 to study race discrimination. Now UNESCO officials are examining whether to continue with the series, an informant said.

The booklet was written by I. P. Tsamerlan, described as a Soviet doctor of philosophy, and S. L. Ronin, a Soviet doctor of law. Titled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," it reiterated Soviet arguments frequently heard in U.N. debates that guarantees against race discrimination were written into the Soviet constitution.

At one place it said "the Soviet Union has solved the problem of nationalities," but acknowledged "this does not mean, of course, that a peak of perfection has been reached. The U.S.S.R. still contains backward elements among whom nationalist prejudices exist."

The booklet contended that the Bolshevik revolution for the first time gave Jews equal rights in the Soviet Union, said racial problems were solved because of Communist Party policy, and quoted Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's assertion that Jews "hold a worthy place" among those responsible for Soviet lunar rocket launchings.

In Washington, Republican National Chairman William E. Miller termed the booklet

"a gratuitous insult to Americans and the free world," and said in a statement that the Kennedy administration should demand that the United Nations repudiate the publication and order its withdrawal from circulation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator, the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs, of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for taking the prompt action which he has taken. I share with him the misgivings he has expressed, and I certainly hope that his subcommittee will go into the question quite fully. There are some points that I cannot understand. I cannot conceive of the action having been taken.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator very much. In reply I should like to say that the committee will be most interested in determining whether any American money—as much as a single nickel of American money—shall go to the support of such a project in Cuba.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How can use of American money be avoided when 40 percent of the U.N. Special Fund is made up of American money?

Mr. CHURCH. That is precisely the question we shall ask. We shall also want to know what the American delegation at the U.N. has done to avoid this decision, and what proposed action the administration intends to take to deal with it.

CUBAN POLICY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is confined to the hospital with a severe attack of influenza. He has asked me to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD today a speech which he would have delivered had he been able to be present.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SIMPSON

Developments in Cuba and last week's massive attempt by the administration to overwhelm and discredit critics of the administration's Cuban policy compel me to raise questions and make observations that I hope will help shed some light on the confused situation regarding communism in Cuba.

In the first place, let me point out that the semantics of offensive and defensive missiles, and exactly how many Soviet troops are in Cuba, are largely irrelevant to the more important basic issue of whether any Communist presence is to be allowed in the Western Hemisphere.

For nearly 150 years American foreign policy has rested on a bedrock of strength; a bedrock that, until the present administration came into power, had been a clear directive to all foreign powers to keep out of the Western Hemisphere. That bedrock is the Monroe Doctrine which is just as important to our foreign posture now as it was in 1823, or in 1940, or in the Guatemalan incident of 1954. The State Department admitted as late as October 29, 1962, that the

principle of the Monroe Doctrine remains valid even though the "old imperialism of Western Europe has been replaced by the new and far stronger political and ideological imperialism of international communism." Despite this support for the doctrine and its long history of effectiveness, the administration has attempted to supplant it with something called the Kennedy doctrine which has come to typify uncertainty, indecision and vacillation.

Our failure to revitalize and employ the Monroe Doctrine in Cuba precipitated the tragedy which has uprooted hundreds of thousands of Cubans and placed communism on our very doorstep. This has led to the development of an insidious philosophy which many minds of this continent regard as the Khrushchev doctrine: That any leftist or Communist movement that manages to murder or bludgeon its way into power in the Western Hemisphere will be sustained in power by the force of Soviet arms. This is the credo of Castro as he spews his venom toward the other nations of the Americas. This is the fear in the hearts of Latin leaders who see the protectionist image of the United States fading away and feel they must look elsewhere for protection and support.

BRIEFING

Last week's unprecedented television briefing by the Secretary of Defense was an excellent attempt to prove a negative proposition. It purported to establish the latitudes of Mr. McNamara's knowledge of Cuban affairs. When viewed in the context of the Department's previous admissions of news manipulation, it is questionable how much credibility can be placed on the performance. The briefing might have given us an insight into the amount of information we do have concerning weapons in Cuba, but it only hinted at some of the intelligence gaps which remain.

Even Secretary McNamara and Mr. McCone of the CIA could not find concurrence in their statements of almost the same day on the effectiveness of aerial surveillance. While Mr. McNamara stated: "I am satisfied that there are no offensive weapons systems in Cuba, and I am satisfied of this beyond any reasonable doubt," Mr. McCone was admitting that: "Absolute assurance on these matters, however, could only come from continuing penetrating on-site inspections." I agree with Mr. McCone although it points up a substantial difference of opinion from two high administration officials on whose judgment rests much of the decisionmaking for our national security.

Aerial surveillance, as clearly implied by Mr. McCone, is effective only to the extent that objects are visible to a photographic eye. Obviously, missiles stored underground or in cleverly disguised shelters could not be identified or their nature interpreted solely through aerial photography. It can be stated with certainty that offensive weapons unloaded at night, stored in caves, and not set up in outside launching areas, would remain undetected. The extent of the military threat they pose would be commensurate with the speed with which they could be readied for firing.

SOURCES

Underground sources of unimpeachable honesty and integrity—the same sources which alerted the West to Russian troops in Cuba in mid-1962—now warn of such missiles stored in caves and tunnels at several points in Cuba. These reports, like those of last year, are made available to intelligence officials, but for unexplained reasons, they are regularly discounted. The sources have warned of missile concealment in the gigantic cavern of Santo Tomas, very near the San Cristobal missile base in Pinar del Rio Province.

The Remedios missile base site is conspicuously close to the cave of La Puntilla.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2189

In the tract valuation report for one of the exchanges, a subtraction error of \$1 in computing timber stumpage rates caused a \$1.198 undervaluation of selected land.

Tract valuation reports and related documents on the four land exchanges that we reviewed contained undocumented, incomplete, and erroneous data on a number of factors affecting the appraised value of the exchange lands and timber thereon.

There is no excuse for such a discrepancy in the valuation of our valuable timber reserves; and while the Comptroller General does not specifically charge fraud, the kindest thing that can be done to the officials responsible is to charge them with gross incompetence or negligence of duty. In any event, someone should be fired.

I compliment the Comptroller General upon his report of December 28, 1962, and suggest that the Agriculture Committees of both the House and the Senate take notice of these transactions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the December 28 letter of the Comptroller General be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON, December 28, 1962.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Herewith is our report on the review of certain land exchanges in the Pacific Northwest region (region 8), Portland, Oreg., of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

The act of March 20, 1922, as amended (16 U.S.C. 485), the legal authority for the exchanges, requires that the value of Federal land or timber given in an exchange may not exceed the value of the private land received by the Government.

The report deals primarily with two land exchanges in which Federal lands and timber conveyed to proponents (private parties) were sold by the proponents shortly after the exchanges for amounts that totaled about \$207,000 more than the appraised values, as established by the Forest Service, of the lands and timber received by the Government. Furthermore, the amounts received by the proponents from the sales of the selected lands (Federal tracts given in the exchanges) totaled about \$222,000 more than the values at which the Forest Service appraised these same lands. A major factor contributing to the differences between sale and appraised values of the selected lands was a significant underestimate by the Forest Service of the volume and value of merchandise timber on the selected lands.

To provide more assurance that appraisals of lands and timber in proposed exchanges will reasonably express the values of the resources involved so as to meet criteria of legislation on exchanges of equal values, we are recommending to the Chief, Forest Service, that agency procedures be reexamined with a view toward obtaining improved appraisals of selected and offered lands. Our report contains specific suggestions to help achieve such improvement.

A summary of our findings is presented in the forepart of the report. The views of Forest Service officials on these matters are considered in the report.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION OF ACTIONS BY U.N.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am extremely disturbed by the current impact and future implications of two stories concerning the United Nations which appeared on the front page of the Washington Post this morning. The one deals with the decision of the U.N. Special Fund to contribute financial assistance to a Cuban agricultural project on a 6-month test basis. The other describes rising protests against a Soviet-prepared publication of last year, issued by the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, on the subject of supposed racial and political equality in the U.S.S.R.

My most immediate concern, of course, is with the Special Fund action which, on its face, seems to give aid and comfort to a Cuban regime condemned by all countries of the Western Hemisphere. It is very difficult for me to perceive any justification for that action, and I believe the Senate is entitled to a full accounting. I also find it very difficult to understand how UNESCO can permit itself to be used by any one nation as an outlet for that country's political propaganda about its pretended domestic virtues.

In order to get all the facts straight on these two developments, I am taking immediate action to convene, as chairman, the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We shall be meeting as early as possible—probably on Monday morning—to receive a full explanation from high-level officials of the Department of State in executive session.

I know that many of my colleagues in this body are also upset about these circumstances involving the United Nations. I want to give them this early assurance that both matters will be fully looked into by the appropriate committee of the Senate. Thereafter, we shall make available to the public as much information as we possibly can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles published in the Washington Post to which I referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.N. TO GIVE FARM AID TO CUBA—6-MONTH TEST PLAN WILL HELP CROP DIVERSIFICATION
(By Dan Kurzman)

The United Nations decided yesterday to grant agricultural aid to Cuba in a move that the administration fears may add fuel to the attacks by some Congressmen on its Cuban policies.

The governing council of the 18-nation United Nations special fund will contribute on a 6-month test basis to a Cuban crop diversification program after having stalled on the decision since the project received initial approval in May 1961. The political dynamite lies in the fact that the United States furnishes about 40 percent of the fund.

Washington expressed regrets over the decision, though Paul G. Hoffman, American

managing director of the fund, said that no American money would be used on the project.

He has argued that this project would not injure the United States nor help Fidel Castro. Although Hoffman's role is that of an international civil servant, he has intimated that if the special fund ever approved a project that he thought would injure the United States he would resign from his job.

Administration officials may think similarly, but they are concerned that some Congressman might not. Perhaps indicative of things to come, Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Democrat, of Florida, called the U.N. action a "jarring note to the already pronounced discord over Cuba. There should be firm resolve on the part of the United States to make no contribution to any United Nations fund which is used to thwart the foreign policies of the United States."

The fund's action is based on a policy that has been staunchly supported by the United States since the fund was born 4 years ago. Dispensing of aid money under this policy is determined strictly by the technical feasibility of proposed projects, never by political considerations.

As a result, the United States has been hamstrung in putting forth effective objections to the Cuban project. It has maintained that the aid cannot be efficiently applied in view of the emigration of qualified Cuban farm technicians, the slaughter of livestock, the plundering of other physical resources, and the general disorganization of Cuban agriculture resulting from the replacement of Cubans with Soviet technicians.

Such arguments, however, have made little impression on most members of the fund council, which consists of nine developed and nine underdeveloped nations.

But the council did agree to approve the project on a 6-month test basis, which would involve the expenditure of only about \$100,000 in U.N. funds. If at the end of that period the project proves feasible it will be extended for about 5 years with the U.N. share of the cost totaling about \$1.2 million. American officials would not state whether the United States would approve the program if the 6-month test proves successful.

The aid is contingent on the expenditure by Cuba itself of about \$2 million over the 6 years.

U.S. officials point out that although Washington contributes some 40 percent of the money in the special fund, it is actually paying only 17 percent of the total funds, including that part spent by the recipient countries themselves, devoted to U.N.-supported projects. U.N. contributions to 289 projects in about 70 underdeveloped nations amounts to \$257 million. Recipients are investing \$332 million.

U.S. EXPERTS BARRED

Hoffman said that the United States will be able to assure that no dollars will be used on the Cuban project by simply banning the use of American equipment and experts from participating in the program. Expenses will be met with the currencies of countries contributing to the scheme.

In any event, Hoffman pointed out, 5 to 10 years will be required before Cuba stands to benefit from the project. He added that if political considerations determined whether a nation was deserving of aid, few countries would receive assistance. Despite the objections of some nations, he stated, South Korea, the Republic of China, and South Vietnam are obtaining aid under the fund.

The United States did not ask for a vote on the question of aid to Cuba because it was evident that such a vote would have favored Cuba.

in La Cantera farm, in Las Villas Province. It seems an odd coincidence that many of the acknowledged missile sites that figured in the October crisis were near caves of sufficient size to store missiles and other equipment. The Santo Tomas Cavern has over 8 miles of high ceilinged tunnel area, and the entire island is honeycombed with over 800 separate caverns.

Reliable Cuban underground sources have also pointed to the construction of at least three, and possibly five, submarine bases. The sources are sufficiently convinced of their facts to pinpoint two of the bases, one of which is only 80 miles northwest of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. I noticed in Sunday's paper that my colleague, Senator Arken, has also warned of these bases.

There is only one manner of ascertaining whether missile or submarine bases remain in Cuba. That method is, as the President admitted in last week's news conference, on-site inspection which was a key issue of our blockade last October.

Another report, discounted by the administration, comes from the reputable military specialist, Rear Adm. Edward J. O'Donnell, who said that "Cuba is stronger now than it was before the missile crisis."

THREAT

Great emphasis has been placed on the question of Cuba as a military threat to the hemisphere. I would like to broaden the definition of a military threat to correlate it in some manner with guerrilla warfare and covert military action. Secretary McNamara says there is no evidence of Castro's attempt to export his Marxist revolution, but perhaps no great effort is being expended to seek such patent evidence.

Early in January President Ricardo Perez Godoy's military junta in Peru announced that it had smashed a plot masterminded by Moscow and Havana. Informed Government sources said, last week, that Castro has begun shipping arms to his Communist admirer, Cheddi Jagan, of British Guiana. The same Government sources admitted that this was the first confirmed case of what the United States has long suspected—that Castro intends to use his heavily fortified island as a transmission point for arms and propaganda.

Early this month Guatemala President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes stated that Russian submarines are transplanting men and arms in Latin America. The Guatemalan President said this clandestine operation has been underway since 1959. I strongly urge Mr. McNamara to study these and other incidents, and perhaps he will find the evidence of which he now seems bereft.

Aside from direct subversion, Communist agents in Cuba have a convenient first floor observation post from which to keep tabs on the U.S. space program at Cape Canaveral. Underground reports say that unusually large quantities of unorthodox electronic transmission equipment has been unloaded in Cuba. It is said to be of a type uncommon in normal communications use.

On this same subject, between the towns of Wejay and Rincon in the eastern portion of Havana Province, the Soviets have constructed a powerful radio transmitter which allows them to maintain a liaison with Moscow and Peking.

Another factor in the "threat" controversy that is ignored by the administration is Castro's effect on the Alliance for Progress. We have pumped \$2 billion in Latin America under the program, but the crux of the alliance—the investment of American companies in Central and South America—has failed to meet even half of the earlier predictions. Less than \$150 million of a hoped for \$300 million of American investment capital has gone into the Alliance countries. The uncertainty of governmental stability, the

political question mark symbolized by Castro, and the dictator's previous seizures of American industries are said to be the biggest factors in the reluctance of investors to take risks in Latin America.

QUESTIONS

In a letter I dispatched this morning to Secretary of Defense McNamara, I propounded a number of questions which have not been answered by the administration. They are:

1. If the air surveillance is so effective, why were the missiles of the October crisis not detected when they reached the ports of Cuba and when they were transported to their respective sites?

2. If the United States did not detect the arrival of the missiles, how do we know that the 42 missiles, reportedly withdrawn, were the total amount of medium and intermediate range rockets shipped to Cuba? Can we rely on Khrushchev's word?

3. If the U.S. Government is unable to assure that medium and intermediate range missiles are not camouflaged or hidden in caves or underground installations in Cuba, why did the President lift the blockade without obtaining the on-site inspection which he had considered essential in his speech of October 22? How can on-site inspection at this crucial time be considered a dead issue?

4. How does the U.S. Government account for the admitted presence in Cuba of at least 17,000 Russian soldiers and military experts if during the October crisis the official estimates never exceeded 12,000? Did the air surveillance fail to determine the real number of troops or has there been a considerable military buildup in Cuba since the October crisis?

5. Have we conceded Russia a charter of impunity to stockpile in Cuba tons of arms which could make the strategic island an impregnable fortress from which to subvert and conquer Latin America?

6. Are we going to tolerate the Soviet military intervention in Cuba as long as we do not have an aerial photograph of a so-called offensive missile pointed at us? Is this the new interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, and the 1962 joint resolution on Cuba?

7. Are we going to continue with the same policy which led to the missile crisis last October and which has not stopped Russia nor has stemmed Castro communist subversion throughout the hemisphere? Is it enough to say we are concerned as we contemplate the progressive undermining of democracy in Latin America and the enslavement and destruction of Cuba?

8. Why have we chosen to play down the threat of the exportation of Castro's revolution while at the same time ordering the establishment of a new group of anti-guerrilla military experts that will be based in the Panama Canal Zone to help Latin American countries cope with any Communist fomented uprisings? Is there in reality a great threat of the spread of Castro's Marxist line to other countries?

9. Why has the President failed to grasp the temper of American public opinion which he recognized in the October crisis and which is now strongly opposed to our ineffective Cuban policy?

10. If the abandonment of our Jupiter missile bases in Turkey and elsewhere was contemplated long before the Cuban crisis as the administration has said, and if this abandonment is not in anyway contingent on Khrushchev's withdrawal of some missiles from Cuba, why were our overseas bases so lavishly praised and verbally defended by the Defense Department as late as October 29, 1962? When Khrushchev eased international tensions prior to November 7, was it with the understanding that we would give up our overseas Jupiter bases?

11. Did the Soviet ship *Atkarsk* dock at the port of Cienfuegos last December 5? Was a highly secret cargo, quarantined from regular stevedores, unloaded by security police under command of a Soviet colonel, and was that cargo moved under cover of darkness in trucks driven by Soviet soldiers to caves on the island?

12. Why has the U.S. Government failed to recognize a Cuban government-in-exile, and why is there talk of disbanding the heroic brigade 2506 which fought so gallantly at the Bay of Pigs and which is the rallying point, the symbol of freedom to be regained, for Cuban refugees in the United States?

13. Despite the absence of on-site inspection, does there now exist a pledge, commitment, or understanding between the United States and Russia, or the United States and Cuba, which is a de facto promise not to invade Cuba?

14. What is the reason for the intelligence gap which apparently existed between early September and mid-October, before Senator Keating's statement regarding missiles in Cuba and before the Government's statement in support of the Senator's observations? Were no aerial photographs taken during that period, or was there evidence of the missile buildup in September and early October which was withheld from the public?

15. If we do not stop the onslaught of communism 90 miles off our own shores, how can we expect to maintain world leadership and even survive as a free nation?

16. If we accept the precedent of a Sovietized Cuba, how can we assure the other Latin American Republics that if they fall under Communist domination they will not be abandoned by the United States?

SUMMATION

I noticed in the President's health message that a "bold new approach" is needed in solving the Nation's health needs and that we can procrastinate no more for there is a medical crisis in our midst. Indeed, much of the New Frontier lexicon is wrapped in the crisis superlative—but not so the Cuban issue.

I maintain that it is time for a "bold new approach" to the Communist menace in Cuba—that it is time to halt our procrastination and take the steps necessary to eject Castro and communism from our neighboring island to the south.

It is unconscionable to me that we could allow the Soviet Union to colonize Cuba, 90 miles from the United States; that we could allow them to do this in direct controvention of the Monroe Doctrine; and that we could perpetuate this absurdity as we argue the semantics of defensive or offensive weapons. Our conduct—our so-called Cuban policy—has been preposterous. From a semblance of firmness and cognizance last October, we have regressed to the point of adopting co-existence with and containment of Castro rather than freeing the Cuban people.

The administration has attempted to delude the American public with talk of an imminent settlement of the Cuban crisis. This is manipulation of news and truth in the worst fashion, because the Soviets are in Cuba to stay.

There are at least 17,000 Russian soldiers in Cuba to make sure no uprising topples Castro. In the meantime Khrushchev is building factories and establishing trade ties to bind Cuba's economy with that of the Soviet bloc. They are building permanent barracks to house military units. They are constructing and managing schools, importing Russian teachers, and completely subverting the minds of Cuban children.

Youngsters in their formative years are being taught the glories of a Communist society, of Marx and Lenin, and of a Socialist state. As they enter adulthood, it will be with a firm background of Communist dog-

mas, which will have molded their character and their allegiances irrevocably to communism.

We must understand that the Soviets consider themselves to be in permanent possession of Cuba. They are communizing the economy, the education, and the very nature of life itself in Cuba. Khrushchev is building a Communist state from the basement up. He thinks he is there for the long haul.

Communism in Cuba is the greatest threat affecting the security of the Western Hemisphere and the world. We have been lulled into a false sense of security by an administration which has proven itself unable to cope with the crisis—an administration which alludes to nonexistent claims that the Cuban crisis will be over by March.

It will not be settled by March, or by July, or this year, or next, unless we learn the lesson of history that no nation has ever thrown off communism from within. Castro and communism will not fall until and unless they are pushed. And the United States must supply that push.

FORTHCOMING VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PRESIDENT ROMULO BETANCOURT, OF VENEZUELA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, next week Washington will welcome as an official visitor one of the most distinguished statesmen of the free world—President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela.

President Betancourt was elected to a 5-year term in December 1958 in one of the few really free and honest elections which Venezuela has had. He came to power in a country which had been looted by the corrupt and brutal dictatorship of Col. Marcos Perez Jimenez.

President Betancourt launched a program of social reform and economic development which anticipated the Alliance for Progress by 2 years. His government has tripled expenditures on education while elementary school enrollments have doubled. Low-cost, self-help housing programs have been undertaken in both urban and rural areas. Health services have been improved and expanded and pushed into the countryside. Land reform has made real progress. All of this has been done within the context of orthodox fiscal policies and inflation has been avoided.

It has been done, also, despite the determined, relentless efforts of the Communists and their extreme left-wing allies to topple the Betancourt government by violence and subversion. This Communist campaign of terror takes the form of indiscriminate bombings and shootings in Caracas and of guerrilla activities in some rural areas. The Venezuelan Communists receive nightly encouragement from Radio Havana.

We all saw photographs in the newspapers in the last few days of the Sears, Roebuck warehouse burning.

Castro had made Betancourt his No. 1 target in Latin America, and with good reason. In the success of Betancourt's moderate, enlightened program of reform, the Communists rightly see the greatest threat to their own evil designs on this hemisphere.

So, Mr. President, as a Senator and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign

Relations, I want to add my word of welcome to President Betancourt. I am delighted that he is able to visit our country at this time, and I am sure that the talks he will have with President Kennedy and other officials will be fruitful.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY, ARTICLE BY JAMES RESTON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "How To Turn Victory Into Defeat," by James Reston, which appeared recently in the New York Times, western edition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOW TO TURN VICTORY INTO DEFEAT (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, February 12.—The criticism of President Kennedy's foreign policy is now getting a little out of hand.

No doubt mistakes of tactics and even of taste have been made recently over the handling of Cuba, Canada, Britain, and France, but in the broadest sense, the President is in trouble now, not because his major foreign policies have failed but because they are succeeding.

France and Canada are not refusing to accept U.S. nuclear weapons because they feel that Kennedy has weakened the West, but precisely because they think the West is relatively so strong that they can now follow a more independent policy and risk division within the alliance.

The unity that existed behind the President when he risked war to get the Soviet offensive missiles out of Cuba has vanished, not because he failed to get the missiles and bombers out, but precisely because he got them out and it is now safe to turn around and argue about the secondary issue of the Soviet troops.

Britain did not refuse to accept De Gaulle's terms for entrance into the Common Market because of any weakness in Washington, but precisely because it preferred to go along with the United States and the Atlantic community rather than with De Gaulle and an inward-looking Europe.

The paradox of the present situation is that everything in the cold war remains about the same as it was at the beginning of the year, yet everything seems different.

STAND NOT NEW

De Gaulle was refusing to cooperate with Washington and London on the defense and organization of Europe long before his famous press conference.

Much the same can be said about Canada. Prime Minister Diefenbaker was refusing to accept the U.S. nuclear warheads long before the State Department stumbled clumsily into an internal Canadian squabble; the only new thing is that he has now made an election issue out of Washington's awkward efforts to clarify the facts.

The question now is whether the Kennedy administration could have done anything to avoid the split with De Gaulle, the fight with Canada, and the present situation in Cuba. Much can be said on both sides of all three questions, and the President is certainly not blameless.

He first stumbled into Cuba and then misjudged Moscow's offensive policy there. It may be that he should now be considering a blockade of that island to get the Soviet troops out; that is a matter of opinion. But the critics are going beyond or behind all this to imply what they have not proved, namely, that the President made a deal with

Khrushchev to scrap the missile bases in Turkey and Italy; and beyond this, that the Soviets now have offensive missiles hidden in Cuba.

PROOF OR WITHDRAWAL

These last are charges of stupidity, bad faith or worse, and should either be proved or withdrawn. There is plenty of material on the Cuban issue for hard, fair criticism, and Kennedy's handling of the offensive buildup in Cuba justifies plenty of skepticism, but implications of secret deals and concealed weapons confuse and weaken the country unless they are supported with evidence.

The psychology of the opposition to President Kennedy here is clear enough. First, it is the duty of the opposition to oppose. Also, Kennedy clobbered the Republicans in the last Presidential campaign with charges that they had debased the Nation's prestige overseas. Thereupon, when he achieved power, he found, not the missile gap he had moaned so much about, but enough missile power to scare the Russians.

In this situation, the Republicans are naturally eager to pounce on him when he roughs up our Canadian neighbors or misjudges De Gaulle's intentions, and all this is fair enough.

But the thing has to be kept in perspective. For the conflict with a nation's enemies is more important than the quarrels with its allies, and on balance, the conflict with the Communists is not going too badly.

Meanwhile, fear in the Western Alliance has abated, and without fear a whole new set of problems has arisen, requiring new policies and new criticism.

"We have to learn to live with these problems in Cuba and elsewhere," the President has said. And this of course, is precisely the difficulty. For the American people don't want to learn to live with their problems or with the Russians, especially in Cuba. They want them to go away, all of them, and immediately, if not sooner.

THE ART OF POLITICS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MCGEE, OF WYOMING

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, the February issue of the NEA Journal contains an article entitled "The Art of Politics," written by the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. As a former member of the teaching profession, the Senator from Wyoming directs his remarks to teachers, and reviews for them the nature and importance of politics. I believe other Senators and citizens generally will find his observations about politics of interest, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A REVIEW FOR THE TEACHER ON THE ART OF POLITICS

(By GALE MCGEE, U.S. Senator from Wyoming)

During my years as a college professor, I frequently would ask my students for their definition of a politician. Their answers followed the general stereotype—a hypocritical creature with one hand in somebody else's pocket, a deep freeze in the basement, and a vicuna coat in the closet. In brief, a politician was sort of a confidence man in the public realm. He was the type you would deal with of necessity but would never invite home for dinner. And politics was the craft of outsmarting or outmaneu-

1963

an alliance. We are in the battle, and we are in to stay. I believe we will win—because I am confident the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

DCI THE THREAT FROM CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, at this time I wish to address myself to the Cuban situation. I do this, not for the purpose of adding fuel to the existing controversy but in a sincere effort to put the problem in its proper perspective. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am speaking today only as an individual U.S. Senator and as a U.S. citizen who is honestly disturbed and worried about the present situation.

During the past several weeks, Mr. President, we have witnessed a continuing wave of debate over Cuba. Most of this debate has concerned itself with the question of whether our Soviet adversaries still maintain offensive weapons in Cuba, and with charges and countercharges as to the nature and number of Soviet forces and weapons which are now based in the captive island. While I do not for a moment minimize the importance of these issues, I cannot escape the question of whether the prominence which has been given to them has tended to obscure and bury the basic problem which Communist domination of Cuba presents to us and to the Western Hemisphere. In short, I fear that our concentration on and preoccupation with the more spectacular attraction of the individual trees is preventing the American public from seeing the sinister threat which the forest itself presents.

The undeniable fact of the situation, Mr. President, is that, regardless of the details as to weaponry, we know that the Communists are exerting every effort to increase their power and influence in the Western Hemisphere. That is the basic reason why they are in Cuba. There should be no doubt that they will use the base which they have established, and now control, to advance to the greatest extent possible the aims of international communism. We can be sure that they intend to keep a Communist government in Cuba and to insure that this government wears the "Made in Moscow" label and remains under the direct control of the international Communist movement.

We do not have to be reminded that communism is an implacable, aggressive, resourceful, powerful, and ruthless foe. Never in their history have the Communists voluntarily surrendered any foothold or advantage which they have once gained. They will not do so in Cuba. They are never moved by humanitarian motives or appeals to morality. When they are forced to take one step backward, we may be sure that they are simultaneously preparing to take two steps forward—perhaps on a seemingly unrelated front. They have lied to us before; and they will do so again, whenever it serves their sinister purposes.

It is essential, then, Mr. President, that we face up to the fact that the Communists are now here in the Western Hemisphere, and that they are here to stay—if we permit them to do so. The success which they will achieve in ex-

panding their power and influence in Latin America will depend upon two things: first, the force and weight of their effort; second, the amount of opposition which they meet. If they mount just a small effort, and meet no opposition, the results will be just as inevitable as if they mount a tremendous effort and meet opposition which, while strong, is not quite enough to halt them.

What is worrisome and troublesome to me, Mr. President, is that we seem to have become almost entirely preoccupied by the debate as to whether Moscow has or has not increased or decreased the numbers of specific types of forces and weapons in Cuba and as to what should be done to determine the exact number and types of these forces and weapons. These things are of major importance, certainly, but, in the long run, they may make very little difference—except perhaps to the Soviets' own timetable. An ordinary man without any special knowledge whatsoever can see and understand that.

It is entirely understandable that the reports and charges about the possible presence of Soviet strategic weapons and other forces should attract the greatest public attention. In my judgment, however, these things are but the outward and tangible manifestation of the more basic problem. What concerns me, and, I think, a great majority of my fellow Americans, is whether we, the United States of America, intend to permit a Communist government to exist in Cuba or other Latin American countries. If we do, then we should reconcile ourselves to the fact that these countries will be used as bases to subvert other Latin American nations and that, sooner or later the entire Western Hemisphere may be lost to us. If we do not, then it is time that we take positive action to make it clear that we have the national will and purpose to eradicate all Communist governments in this hemisphere.

I am concerned, Mr. President, because I am uncertain as to what our intentions are, and I think that the ordinary American is concerned for the same reason. Perhaps this concern is coupled with an uneasy sense of national guilt and shame that we have allowed the Cuban situation to develop as it has.

Mr. President, on February 6, 1963, Secretary of Defense McNamara, a man for whom I have great respect and admiration, stood before this Nation in defense of the administration's position on Cuba. He gave one of his typically able and capable performances and I was once again impressed with his ability, knowledge, and tremendous storehouse of information.

However, at the same time I was somewhat concerned and disturbed by the overall tone and thrust of his presentation. I could not suppress a feeling of dismay that Mr. McNamara—the civilian head of our vast military organization—felt compelled to devote his effort almost entirely to the "numbers game"—the question of how many and what types of forces and weapons are now in Cuba—and this in almost overwhelming detail. The roots of the problem were almost entirely ignored.

We must face the hard facts. The Russians may or may not have missiles and other strategic and offensive weapons in Cuba. They may or may not have 35,000 or 40,000 troops there. None of us can be certain about this. However, I refuse to believe that the presence of 10, 20, or 100 missiles in Cuba, or 40, 50, or 100 light bombers, or 17,000, 35,000, or 50,000 troops, would of themselves turn the military balance against us. They have infinitely more powerful forces in Europe—forces which include intercontinental missiles capable of spanning the ocean with death, destruction and devastation—and we do not quail before them.

No, I cannot believe that the existence of such forces in Cuba would of themselves tip the military balance against us. If they would, then we are not as powerful and strong as I have been told. At the same time, we must be realistic and recognize the immediate devastation which such forces could visit upon us.

Thus, while the facts and figures with respect to the military buildup in Cuba are undeniably pertinent and important, I cannot escape the feeling that Secretary McNamara devoted his not inconsiderable talents to one-half of the problem only. Perhaps this was not of his own choosing. It does no good to issue statements and stress facts which, while technically correct, contain entirely erroneous implications from which our people might very well conclude that there is no danger from a Communist government in Cuba or that there has been some basic change in Communist goals.

With respect to Cuba, I believe that we commit a serious and perhaps fatal error if we allow our attention to be monopolized wholly by one spectacular or dramatic act such as the introduction or withdrawal of strategic weapons. If we are hypnotized by this, and by overly meticulous attention to the question of whether or not the military menace to us is increased or decreased fractionally by the presence or absence of certain types or quantities of military forces, it may very well be that we will fail to face up to the basic problem—the fact that international communism has been established and is being maintained in the Western Hemisphere.

The American people, I believe, look for a very simple and fundamental thing with respect to this problem. They want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize this problem and also recognize that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that it is the purpose of our Government to do everything within our power to wipe out all Communist governments in this hemisphere and they want to be told that we have a policy and a plan which will accomplish this, even though risk be involved.

With all deference then I would suggest that the American people be brought a message which will convince them and all the world that our Nation is virile, strong, resolute, vigorous, determined and, above all, unafraid. They want to be assured that the United States

will not countenance the existence of a Moscow dominated government in this hemisphere regardless of how few or how many weapons and troops support it, that our opposition to this evil is based on its existence and not merely upon the strength or weakness of its external manifestations. They want to know that it is our national will and purpose to destroy all such governments and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to effectuate this.

When and if all this is done, and when and if the vital issue is met squarely and directly, I am convinced that petty and partisan voices will be stilled, and that the patriotic people of this Nation will again unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in our times of national crisis.

It is up to us who now occupy office in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and all who have official responsibilities, earnestly to search for an answer to the problem, and earnestly and honestly apply ourselves in our respective ways and in keeping with our obligations to apply policies that will meet the problem and bring about a remedy. I know that we can do it. I believe that we shall do it. I also believe that there is no time to be lost.

Mr. President, in closing, I would like, again to stress that, even though I am chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, our hearings have not progressed very far, and today I speak as an individual Senator and one who is concerned with our great Nation's welfare.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). If there is no further business, pursuant to the previous order the Senate will now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock next Monday.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1963:

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3072, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, O18696, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O19083, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP					
TO	NAME AND ADDRESS		DATE	INITIALS	
1	ER 7E12				
2	DDCI <i>2/15/63</i> <i>1612</i>		<i>2/16/63</i>	<i>AN</i>	
3	DCI			<i>WU</i>	
4	<i>LC 7D01</i>			<i>WZ</i>	
5					
6					
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY		PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL		DISPATCH		RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT		FILE		RETURN	
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION		SIGNATURE	
Remarks:					
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER					
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.				DATE	
Legislative Counsel, 7D01				<i>15 Feb 63</i>	
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL		SECRET	

1963

2253

an alliance. We are in the battle, and we are in to stay. I believe we will win—because I am confident the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

THE THREAT FROM CUBA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, at this time I wish to address myself to the Cuban situation. I do this, not for the purpose of adding fuel to the existing controversy but in a sincere effort to put the problem in its proper perspective. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I am speaking today only as an individual U.S. Senator and as a U.S. citizen who is honestly disturbed and worried about the present situation.

During the past several weeks, Mr. President, we have witnessed a continuing wave of debate over Cuba. Most of this debate has concerned itself with the question of whether our Soviet adversaries still maintain offensive weapons in Cuba, and with charges and countercharges as to the nature and number of Soviet forces and weapons which are now based in the captive island. While I do not for a moment minimize the importance of these issues, I cannot escape the question of whether the prominence which has been given to them has tended to obscure and bury the basic problem which Communist domination of Cuba presents to us and to the Western Hemisphere. In short, I fear that our concentration on and preoccupation with the more spectacular attraction of the individual trees is preventing the American public from seeing the sinister threat which the forest itself presents.

"The undeniable fact of the situation, Mr. President, is that, regardless of the details as to weaponry, we know that the Communists are exerting every effort to increase their power and influence in the Western Hemisphere. That is the basic reason why they are in Cuba. There should be no doubt that they will use the base which they have established, and now control, to advance to the greatest extent possible the aims of international communism. We can be sure that they intend to keep a Communist government in Cuba and to insure that this government wears the "Made in Moscow" label and remains under the direct control of the international Communist movement.

We do not have to be reminded that communism is an implacable, aggressive, resourceful, powerful, and ruthless foe. Never in their history have the Communists voluntarily surrendered any foothold or advantage which they have once gained. They will not do so in Cuba. They are never moved by humanitarian motives or appeals to morality. When they are forced to take one step backward, we may be sure that they are simultaneously preparing to take two steps forward—perhaps on a seemingly unrelated front. They have lied to us before; and they will do so again, whenever it serves their sinister purposes.

It is essential, then, Mr. President, that we face up to the fact that the Communists are now here in the Western Hemisphere, and that they are here to stay—if we permit them to do so. The success which they will achieve in ex-

panding their power and influence in Latin America will depend upon two things: first, the force and weight of their effort; second, the amount of opposition which they meet. If they mount just a small effort, and meet no opposition, the results will be just as inevitable as if they mount a tremendous effort and meet opposition which, while strong, is not quite enough to halt them.

What is worrisome and troublesome to me, Mr. President, is that we seem to have become almost entirely preoccupied by the debate as to whether Moscow has or has not increased or decreased the numbers of specific types of forces and weapons in Cuba and as to what should be done to determine the exact number and types of these forces and weapons. These things are of major importance, certainly, but, in the long run, they may make very little difference—except perhaps to the Soviets' own timetable. An ordinary man without any special knowledge whatsoever can see and understand that.

It is entirely understandable that the reports and charges about the possible presence of Soviet strategic weapons and other forces should attract the greatest public attention. In my judgment, however, these things are but the outward and tangible manifestation of the more basic problem. What concerns me, and, I think, a great majority of my fellow Americans, is whether we, the United States of America, intend to permit a Communist government to exist in Cuba or other Latin American countries. If we do, then we should reconcile ourselves to the fact that these countries will be used as bases to subvert other Latin American nations and that, sooner or later the entire Western Hemisphere may be lost to us. If we do not, then it is time that we take positive action to make it clear that we have the national will and purpose to eradicate all Communist governments in this hemisphere.

I am concerned, Mr. President, because I am uncertain as to what our intentions are, and I think that the ordinary American is concerned for the same reason. Perhaps this concern is coupled with an uneasy sense of national guilt and shame that we have allowed the Cuban situation to develop as it has.

Mr. President, on February 6, 1963, Secretary of Defense McNamara, a man for whom I have great respect and admiration, stood before this Nation in defense of the administration's position on Cuba. He gave one of his typically able and capable performances and I was once again impressed with his ability, knowledge, and tremendous storehouse of information.

However, at the same time I was somewhat concerned and disturbed by the overall tone and thrust of his presentation. I could not suppress a feeling of dismay that Mr. McNamara—the civilian head of our vast military organization—felt compelled to devote his effort almost entirely to the "numbers game"—the question of how many and what types of forces and weapons are now in Cuba—and this in almost overwhelming detail. The roots of the problem were almost entirely ignored.

We must face the hard facts. The Russians may or may not have missiles and other strategic and offensive weapons in Cuba. They may or may not have 35,000 or 40,000 troops there. None of us can be certain about this. However, I refuse to believe that the presence of 10, 20, or 100 missiles in Cuba, or 40, 50, or 100 light bombers, or 17,000, 35,000, or 50,000 troops, would of themselves turn the military balance against us. They have infinitely more powerful forces in Europe—forces which include intercontinental missiles capable of spanning the ocean with death, destruction and devastation—and we do not quail before them.

No, I cannot believe that the existence of such forces in Cuba would of themselves tip the military balance against us. If they would, then we are not as powerful and strong as I have been told. At the same time, we must be realistic and recognize the immediate devastation which such forces could visit upon us.

Thus, while the facts and figures with respect to the military buildup in Cuba are undeniably pertinent and important, I cannot escape the feeling that Secretary McNamara devoted his not inconsiderable talents to one-half of the problem only. Perhaps this was not of his own choosing. It does no good to issue statements and stress facts which, while technically correct, contain entirely erroneous implications from which our people might very well conclude that there is no danger from a Communist government in Cuba or that there has been some basic change in Communist goals.

With respect to Cuba, I believe that we commit a serious and perhaps fatal error if we allow our attention to be monopolized wholly by one spectacular or dramatic act such as the introduction or withdrawal of strategic weapons. If we are hypnotized by this, and by overly meticulous attention to the question of whether or not the military menace to us is increased or decreased fractionally by the presence or absence of certain types or quantities of military forces, it may very well be that we will fail to face up to the basic problem—the fact that international communism has been established and is being maintained in the Western Hemisphere.

The American people, I believe, look for a very simple and fundamental thing with respect to this problem. They want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize this problem and also recognize that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that it is the purpose of our Government to do everything within our power to wipe out all Communist governments in this hemisphere and they want to be told that we have a policy and a plan which will accomplish this, even though risk be involved.

With all deference then I would suggest that the American people be brought a message which will convince them and all the world that our Nation is virile, strong, resolute, vigorous, determined and, above all, unafraid. They want to be assured that the United States

February 14, 1963

will not countenance the existence of a Moscow dominated government in this hemisphere regardless of how few or how many weapons and troops support it, that our opposition to this evil is based on its existence and not merely upon the strength or weakness of its external manifestations. They want to know that it is our national will and purpose to destroy all such governments and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to effectuate this.

When and if all this is done, and when and if the vital issue is met squarely and directly, I am convinced that petty and partisan voices will be stilled, and that the patriotic people of this Nation will again unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in our times of national crisis.

It is up to us who now occupy office in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and all who have official responsibilities, earnestly to search for an answer to the problem, and earnestly and honestly apply ourselves in our respective ways and in keeping with our obligations to apply policies that will meet the problem and bring about a remedy. I know that we can do it. I believe that we shall do it. I also believe that there is no time to be lost.

Mr. President, in closing, I would like again to stress that, even though I am chairman of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, our hearings have not progressed very far, and today I speak as an individual Senator and one who is concerned with our great Nation's welfare.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1963

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). If there is no further business, pursuant to the previous order the Senate will now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock next Monday.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1963:

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3072, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, O18696, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18981, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alden Kingland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Beehier Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Scholdt Murphey, O19338, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).